

JPRS-UWC-88-002

5 APRIL 1988



**FOREIGN  
BROADCAST  
INFORMATION  
SERVICE**

# ***JPRS Report***

## **Soviet Union**

### ***THE WORKING CLASS & THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD***

No 6, November-December 1987

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

19980804 011

# Soviet Union

## THE WORKING CLASS & THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

No 6, November-December 1987

JPRS-UWC-88-002

### CONTENTS

5 APRIL 1988

[The following is a complete translation of the Russian-language bimonthly journal *RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR* published in Moscow by the Institute of the International Workers' Movement of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Refer to the table of contents for a listing of any articles not translated.]

|  |    |
|--|----|
| V.L. Sheynis Critique of Third World Research Criticized<br>[S.L. Agayev; <i>RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR</i> , No 6; pp 86-99]        | 1  |
| Taiwan's Economic Development, Working Class Activity Viewed<br>[V.A. Sycheva; <i>RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR</i> No 6; pp 140-144]   | 10 |
| FRG Professionals' Role in Struggle for Peace, Progress<br>[V.P. Iyerusalimskiy; <i>RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR</i> No 6; pp 178-181] | 14 |
| Book on Trade Union Involvement in Peace Movement Reviewed<br>[A.Ye. Yefremov; <i>RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR</i> No 6; pp 188-189]   | 18 |
| Book on Relationship of Common Market, European Workers<br>[A.A. Iglitskiy; <i>RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR</i> No 6; pp 189-190]      | 19 |
| Ecological Problems of 'Capitalist' Cities<br>[V.N. Baryakin; <i>RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR</i> No 6; pp 192-193]                    | 20 |
| Index of Articles Published in 1987  | 22 |
| Chinese Decrees on Public Enterprises Translated, Published  | 25 |
| Articles in <i>RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR</i> Not Translated   | 25 |
| Publication Data   | 26 |

## THE WORKING CLASS & THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

### V.L. Sheynis Critique of Third World Research Criticized

18070061a Moscow *RABOCHIY KLAS* I  
*SOVREMENNYI MIR* in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 87  
(signed to press 18 Nov 87) pp 86-99

[Article by Semen Lvovich Agayev, doctor of historical sciences, head of a department of the USSR Academy of Sciences International Workers Movement Institute (IMRD): "Political Realities of the Developing World and Social Dialectics"; for a translation of the Sheynis article see JPRS Report: Soviet Union. The Working Class and the Contemporary World No 4, Jul-Aug 87, number JPRS-UWC-87-003, 9 December 87 pp 8-18]

[Text] The social sciences are confronted at the current stage with the difficult job of extension of the ideas and principles of the new political thinking advanced by the CPSU to specific branches of learning and their creative application to the particular features of the subjects being studied, specifically, to the diverse sociopolitical situations which have taken shape in various regions. A preliminary condition of the accomplishment of this task is a carefully considered and profoundly and comprehensively substantiated understanding of the very concept and methodology of the new political thinking and an elucidation of its political essence and spirit and the unity of its aspects of general significance and specific-historical manifestations. All one-sided manifestations severing individual components of the new thinking from and, even more, counterposing them to one another can only distort its meaning as an integral phenomenon, having breached the principle of a dialectical, socio-philosophical approach.

One of the first special attempts to extend the ideas and principles of the new political thinking to study of the problems of the developing countries was made by the well-known Soviet economist V.L. Sheynis (a). The genre of the publication entitled "The Developing Countries and the New Political Thinking" and the tasks posed by the author are characterized as follows: "An attempt has been made in the thoughts offered for discussion to specify or, at least, take a new look at certain prevalent general propositions taken as being axiomatic" (p 78). The author justifies the legitimacy of such an attempt within the "thoughts" framework by the fact that the new political thinking presupposes not a "partial adjustment" but a "radical reconsideration" of settled notions, an "emphatic break" with "idea-phobia" and the removal of "no-go areas" for criticism in the field of theory (ibid.).

Such an approach to the problem of extending the ideas and principles of the new political thinking to specific branches of the social sciences would not seem to be sufficiently substantiated. First, the accomplishment of the said problem is connected, I believe, not with an

"emphatic break" with past achievements and scientific quest but with a continuation thereof on a new basis, not with a "radical reconsideration" of settled notions but with a reinterpretation thereof based on the results that have already been achieved and not with an expansion of the "zone of criticism" in the field of theory and methodology of Marxism-Leninism but with the continued creative development with reference to the situation of today and tomorrow of the same theory and methodology. The nihilistic tilt in an interpretation of the tasks of the new political thinking in fact ignores the dialectic of the continuity and innovativeness characteristic of all truly scientific knowledge and, even more, the political and ideological vision of the present and future world borne out by practice. Second, the approach proposed by V.L. Sheynis based on a combination of obviously "contentious standpoints" and "deliberately accentuated debatable assertions" (ibid.) forces the reader to ponder on his own the author's reservations and reticences. And this is fraught also with the possibility of the distortion of some of his ideas.

V.L. Sheynis expresses at the start of the publication dissatisfaction with the unequivocal evaluations predominant in literature of the problem of the developing countries' backwardness connected with the existing North-South gap or with colonialism or with the emergent states' unequal position in the world capitalist economic system. "Without disregarding either," he proposes that the "deeper" (!) roots of the said gap be sought, first, in the socio-cultural traditions of the developing countries and, second, in the policy of local social forces ("antidemocratic, antiprogressist and simply irresponsible") which came to replace the colonial power in some of these countries (pp 78-79). Without disputing the need for a comprehensive study of the said problem, I would like to take issue with the political "outcome" of V.L. Sheynis' thoughts, which in fact calls in question the primacy of the task of the maximum expansion of the "anti-imperialist front" (p 79—author's quotation marks), although, in our view, it can be a question only of the ways and means of the accomplishment of this task. The sole realistic argument employed by the author to substantiate his position is the reference to "a highly dangerous phenomenon, which has already been indicated (although not studied in practice) in our scientific press—'reactionary anti-imperialism'" (ibid.). The reference is, most likely, to the phenomenon of Islamic fundamentalism most strikingly manifested in present-day Iran. But this definition—"reactionary anti-imperialism"—is not an adequate expression of the essence of this phenomenon, which is based on an ideology which is by nature isolationist (with its basic "neither West nor East" slogan).

V.L. Sheynis connects denial of the priority nature of the task of the maximum expansion of the anti-imperialist front with the danger of subordinating scientific study to the present notion of a choice between two paths of development—capitalist and noncapitalist. Without going into the question of the substantiated nature of

such a connection, it is possible to agree with the author that "in the majority of cases the noncapitalist path has not yet shown the hoped-for progress" (p 80) and that "the noncapitalist path on the periphery of the world capitalist economy has not become and will hardly in the foreseeable future become a sufficiently convincing alternative" (ibid.). While having gone on to put forward the quite productive idea that the search for a noncapitalist path is represented here primarily by the "socialist developing countries" (China, Vietnam, Cuba, Albania) and only secondarily by "developing countries of a socialist orientation" (Ethiopia, Angola, the PDRY and so forth), the author in fact advocates, however, preservation of the evolved state and political demarcation between capitalism and socialism. And not only on account of the danger of an unmanageable military-political chain reaction occurring but also owing to the possibility of an increase as a result of the expansion of the zone of socialism in the already "significant load" accruing to the most developed socialist countries (p 82).

The above-mentioned position of V.L. Sheynis is confirmed also in his opinion to the effect that for the "upper echelon" of the developing countries the previous formulation of the question concerning a "break" with the course of capitalist transformation "has become altogether pointless for the process... has moved far enough ahead" (p 80). But the example of our country, to which the author refers (p 79), shows that a "break" with capitalist transformation understood in the broad sense is possible at any stage thereof, however far it has advanced. In terms of comparable indicators of capitalist development tsarist Russia was not less developed, it would seem, than any contemporary emergent country. If, however, the limits of capitalist transformation are determined with regard for the path trodden as of the present day by the developed capitalist countries, formulation of the question concerning a "break" with the corresponding process could be entirely legitimate for Russia also. "Were it not for the war," V.I. Lenin observed, "Russia could have gone for years and decades even without a revolution against the capitalists" (2, vol 32, p 31). The question arises: should the peoples of the developing countries proceeding along the path of capitalist development be deprived of an alternative socialist prospect and the corresponding political stimuli since their present path does not, as the author acknowledges, promise in the foreseeable future "economic equalization in line with the highest or median world models even (not to mention socio-cultural unification)" (p 82)? V.L. Sheynis' opinion on this question becomes clear in the course of subsequent reflections concerning the emergent countries' development prospects.

As a preliminary, the author formulates the initial premises of his overall position. The most important of them is the idea that "the identification of capitalism as such with the economic laws of modern *production* (my italics—S.A.) equally obligatory for capitalism and socialism, which has taken firm hold in our country, is theoretically unwarranted and practically futile" (p 82).

The idea is undoubtedly correct, the more so in that the question is framed in a narrow plane—with reference to production as a technological process. V.L. Sheynis cites here K. Marx's pronouncement that "only... a vulgar economist cannot conceive of forms which have developed at the heart of capitalist production separate from and free of their antagonistic capitalist nature" (1, vol 25, pt 1, p 426). But he does not have a word to say about the direct meaning of this statement—the varying manifestation of the general laws of production under the conditions of different social and economic systems. And nonetheless maintains that our literature fails to provide a "truly universal interpretation" of the proposition of K. Marx just quoted (p 83). This is explained by the lengthy period of opposition of the two systems, the threat of "capitalist restoration" (author's quotation marks) in the first post-October decades, the "skeptically-guarded" attitude toward the "convergence hypothesis" and so forth, which "formulated a kind of 'rejection complex' preventing an understanding of common laws" (ibid.). Given this approach to the problem in question, the attitude of V.L. Sheynis himself toward the "convergent hypothesis" remains, apart from all else, not entirely clear.

The author goes on to provide an interpretation of such a most important principle of the new political thinking as the question of the process of the formation of a contradictory, but interdependent world. It ensues from the opinions which he has put forward that if the corresponding proposition is accepted "uncompromisingly and consistently," the interdependence which exists in the worldwide economy has to be present in "our scientific consciousness... in the form of an underlying principle," and the contradictions, "in the form of reservations" (ibid.). Yet the material of the 27th CPSU Congress interprets this question entirely differently: "The combination of the competition and confrontation of the two systems and the growing trend toward the interdependence of states of the world community is the real *dialectic* (my italics—S.A.) of modern development. It is thus, *through a struggle of opposites* (my italics—S.A.), that a contradictory, but interdependent, largely integral world is with difficulty, gropingly to a certain extent, as it were, taking shape" (3, pp 20-21).

Proceeding from this general standpoint, V.L. Sheynis poses the question of the need for a "certain adjustment of our ideas concerning also the place of the developing countries in the world economy" (p 83). He begins with the relatively justified assertion, we believe, that the objective course of development has confronted the developing countries with a choice between the stability and efficiency of production. We also have to agree with the solutions proposed by the author, which, he believes, "can only be compromise solutions, with the emphases shifted sometimes to one, sometimes to another aspect of the problem," and cannot be "either purely economic or exclusively political" (pp 83-84). However, the non-legitimate interpretation of the proposition concerning a "contradictory, but interdependent world" adduced

above is reflected in negative manner here also. While rigidly counterposing possibilities of increased dependence, a growth of social contrasts and the threat of internal conflicts on the one hand and an intensification of backwardness and atrophied development on the other V.L. Sheynis nonetheless inclines to the opinion that the first of them is less dangerous than the second (ibid.). Since, in his view, the objective predominant trend will be the intensification not only of international economic, political and cultural but also social relations and also the gradual limitation of the zone of state sovereignty (p 83). Do not such conclusions disarm the developing countries in their struggle to overcome "the particularly dangerous and destructive forms of asymmetrical interdependence for the weakest participants" in the capitalist subsystem of the worldwide economy mentioned by the author himself (ibid.)? In addition, the "economic independence" concept employed by the author has in fact the meaning with which the "autarkic economy" concept is usually invested, although the supporters of this concept in the modern world may be counted in single figures.

A dialectical approach to the problem formulated by V.L. Sheynis requires an all-around consideration of the fact that the imperatives of the constructive, creative interaction of states and peoples may be realized in practice only under the conditions of an improvement in the entire system of international economic relations. For this reason promotion of the growing trend toward interdependence on an equal, just basis requires not a limitation but, on the contrary, an expansion of the zone of state sovereignty and not a weakening but a strengthening of the economic independence of each individual state. It was not fortuitous that the document "Overcoming Underdevelopment and the Establishment of a New International Economic Order" adopted at the 28-29 May 1987 Berlin meeting of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee linked the demand for fundamental changes in political thinking directly with recognition of the developing countries' right to exercise inalienable sovereignty over national natural resources, "and the solution of the problem of underdevelopment, with a strengthening of national self-sufficiency and assured economic independence (5, 10 June 1987).

Turning to the question of the economic mechanism "wherewith the developing countries can alone tackle the main task with which they have been objectively confronted by the course of history—overcoming and diminishing backwardness"—V.L. Sheynis formulates a number of interesting ideas. They concern the correlation of problems of the development of the public sector and government regulation of all spheres of the economy, the stimulation of self-regulating processes in the economy based on market relations and the formation of a competitive mechanism and a strategy of the gradual modernization of traditional and intermediate forms of the economy and the utmost use of the advantages of foreign enterprise (p 84). However, the author has nothing to say about which sociopolitical forces in the developing countries of the capitalist path are capable, going

against their own narrow-class interests, of implementing sufficiently firmly and at the same time flexibly the ideal strategy of economic development which they have outlined corresponding to the national goals of overcoming backwardness. This approach to the question is in this case also evidently determined by V.L. Sheynis' distinctive interpretation of the aspects of the new political thinking which he describes as tendencies toward "the primacy of interests and values common to all mankind over national-state, class, group and so forth interests" and toward an ability "to see the opposite side not as an enemy but as a partner" (p 77).

It would not be legitimate, it would seem, to interpret the growth of the significance of values common to all mankind in the general category of class, national-state, group and other interests mentioned in the CPSU material in the plane of the absolute subordination of the second to the first, which acquire, in accordance with the logic of such an interpretation, a predominant position. The demand for a dialectical approach in this instance obviously amounts to an elucidation of their correlation not within the framework of the "domination—subordination" antinomy but in the context of equal interaction within the confines of the new contradictory unity. Not only a dogmatic absolutization of the fundamental contrast of the two world social systems signifying a renunciation of joint efforts in the search for ways to preserve peace and life on Earth but also an essentially antihistorical glossing over and blurring of the confrontation between capitalism and socialism, as a result of which the need for struggle for social progress is denied, are unacceptable in this connection. The insistent need for the wholeness of the world community to be taken into consideration by no means precludes recognition of each people's unconditional right to independent choice of development path. For under modern conditions it is a question not of conservation of the evolved wholeness but of its free development in an atmosphere of general security, which not only must not but may not be created by way of the artificial preservation of the social status quo. Thus the real novelty of the new political thinking consists—and this should be emphasized particularly—not of a renunciation of the class approach to reality but its correlation with the demands of the modern era.

The solutions proposed by V.L. Sheynis are of two interconnected aspects. On the one hand it is essential to overcome a "one-sided evaluation" of the activity of the TNC and the recommendations of the IMF, the World Bank and other international organizations, abandoning "the idea that the social nature of these institutions itself forces them to put forward plans which obviously run counter to objective development interests on the periphery of the world capitalist economy" (p 84). On the other, "we must evidently, *at a minimum*, (my italics—S.A.) refrain from an evaluation of what is happening in the developing countries and, even more, recommendations to them from the standpoints of an idealization of the economic model from which we ourselves are currently endeavoring to escape" (p 85).

V.L. Sheynis sweeps aside possible objections that the USSR is at a different stage of development and that the economic mechanism which had taken shape in our country on the frontier of the 1920's-1930's was at that time not only adequate to the conditions of that time but the sole possible mechanism: the optimum nature of a supercentralized structure "was hardly indisputable for its time either and merits serious theoretical discussion unfettered by taboos which are superficial in relation to scientific study" (ibid.). However, the new political thinking (whose foreign policy aspects are undoubtedly inseparable from domestic policy aspects) proceeds, as known, not from the counterposing but from the dialectical unity and mutual complementariness of centralized planned leadership of the national economy and the independence of its individual components in an integral system of management of the economy. The opinion exists that the strictest centralization established back in the 1930's, intensified in the war years and preserved, in the main, under the conditions of the postwar restoration also was inevitable in a country which was far from being the most economically developed and which found itself face to face with the capitalist world. It "assured the accomplishment as quickly as possible of strategic tasks which had in developed capitalist countries taken decades," although was not devoid of errors and distortions, violations of legality and willful wild oscillations (4, pp 41-42).

As additional reasoning in support of his viewpoint, V.L. Sheynis cites the particular features of the postwar development of China and Vietnam, all of whose grim peripeteias he links exclusively with "rigidly centralized structures" (pp 81-82). At the same time, however, consideration is not given to the motley diversity of phases of internal evolution determining also the distinctive nature of the present changes in each socialist country. Yet the differences in pursuit of the "restructuring policy," the "policy of socialist renovation" and so forth constantly emphasized by the leaders of the fraternal parties—from the Polish United Workers Party through the Vietnam Communist Party—have been brought about precisely by the difference in development levels and the particular features of the implementation of socialist transformations at preceding stages, the specifics of national-cultural traditions and so forth. To ignore these differences and attempt to treat all alike, repeating certain aspects of the sorry experience of the past, would in our time be an unforgivable vulgarization of the idea of the unity of the socialist community, which is rightly perceived now by all communist parties through the prism of diversity in practice.

So the publication in question proposes on the one hand an opening of the road to the activity of the TNC and, particularly, the recommendations of the IMF, the World Bank and such, inasmuch as their plans are not directly connected with the "social nature" of these institutions, and, on the other, that we renounce, "at a minimum," recommendations emanating from an idealization of the past economic model of the USSR inasmuch as.... There is in fact no need to complete the

author's reasoning here. "As the restructuring processes in our country gain momentum," he writes elsewhere, "our ideas concerning socialism will very likely move increasingly far away from actual social relations in the majority of developing countries of a socialist orientation" (p 80). The author's position shows through to an even greater extent if it is considered that as yet all these countries without exception have employed a strictly centralized model largely similar to ours. But what should we do "at the maximum"? Recommend to them, perhaps, the new model which we have adopted? V.L. Sheynis has an answer for this also: "To what extent these countries, in accordance with objective conditions, can and their leading forces wish to evolve in the direction of renewed socialism is a question which requires special discussion" (ibid.).

So where is the way out of the situation brought about in the developing countries by the absence, which is in fact affirmed in the publication in question, of the sociopolitical forces which are capable of consistently implementing the ideal economic development strategy outlined therein? In the extension to the domestic life of these countries, perhaps, of such an international aspect of the new political thinking as the need for the solution of their problems on the paths of the constructive, creative interaction of states and peoples on the scale of the whole planet, that is, "with regard for the interests of all parties, consensus" (pp 77-78)? This solution most corresponds, it would seem, to the position of V.L. Sheynis, in whose opinion "the economic *mechanism* (my italics—S.L.) quite generally (and for this reason primitively) delineated above is not specifically capitalist or socialist. It is a mechanism adequate to the development of the present-day productive forces ambivalent in relation to capitalism and socialism" (p 85).

The economic measures proposed in the publication in question undoubtedly could and would need to be implemented both in countries of a capitalist development path and in states of a socialist orientation. But, after all, the very implementation of these measures would in any instance in time acquire this social thrust or the other depending on which sociopolitical forces implemented them. And, in general, if the laws of *production* as a technological process (and individual economic measures) may be obligatory equally for capitalism and socialism, is some in any way integral economic *mechanism* capable of preserving for a more or less prolonged stretch of time an ambivalent nature in respect of these two different social and economic *systems*? (b) An affirmative answer to this question would express, I believe, no more than a subjective intention to rise above the class contradictions of the present day, an intention which it has never yet been possible to make a reality.

V.L. Sheynis' subsequent thoughts summing up the assessments of "third world" development prospects are indicative. He proposes primarily the "more emphatic riddance of the ideological and theoretical construction

of the crisis which is allegedly constantly intensifying and growing here and development leading to impasse" (p 85). If in this case the author is referring to scientific literature, it would still be more accurate, in our view, to speak not of "crisis and development leading to *impasse*" but of the crisis, *impasse*-like nature of *development*. This clarification neutralizes, it would seem, the critical thrust of the adduced expression. V.L. Sheynis himself writes that "many of the phenomena, painful and brutal frequently, which make up the 'crisis of capitalist development' in the 'third world' concept are a form of this development" (ibid.), notes the "galvanization here of conflict potential" and also the "conflict nature of internal development," which together with other factors "makes the situation historically unprecedented" (p 86), points to "the capacity of the traditional consciousness for long consolidating domination of important areas of social being, including economic behavior" (ibid.), emphasizes the inevitability of "periodic exacerbation" (p 88) and so forth. Do not these affirmations confirming the possibility of lengthy backward movements testify in support of the proposition of the crisis, *impasse*-like nature of *development*?

The author's opinions on the question at issue amount to substantiation of the possibility, regularity and desirability virtually (in the name of a lessening of backwardness) of both the economic and, particularly, social disintegration of the modern and traditional sectors and structures. V.L. Sheynis recognizes here that such a "considered and objective approach" will not be supported in the developing countries themselves, that the supporters of such an approach "are frequently accused of 'elitism' and an 'armchair view' of the sufferings of millions of people" and that "indeed, social science forfeits its active and humanitarian functions if it becomes indifferent to the fate of those who see the destruction of traditional principles and the forced coexistence of the 'consumer society' and the 'society of the poor' as the end of the world" (p 85). "But it has to be considered," the author nonetheless continues, "that the economic mechanism which is capable of ensuring a real reduction in backwardness in the developing world will, as a rule... accelerate social contrasts and society's disintegration" (pp 85-86). It is manifestly a question here of the capitalist development mechanism inasmuch as a socially oriented economic mechanism aims, as is known, not at the acceleration but, on the contrary, the "resorption" and gradual elimination of "social contrasts and the disintegration of society" (although this initially entails certain economic costs). Thus according to V.L. Sheynis' thoughts rid of their inherent reticences and reservations, a "real reduction in backwardness in the developing world" is possible only on the paths of capitalist development, to which there is today "no... serious alternative" (p 86). The author's observations concerning the "naivete" of attempts "to combine the 'good' features of one *production system* (my italics—S.A.) with the same features of another," the "utopian nature" of the aspiration to have done with spontaneous processes and the preferability of "choosing the less

painful options and lessening contradictions" (ibid.) may also serve as particular confirmation of this conclusion. Such is the ultimate outcome of the "ambivalence" in relation to capitalism and socialism proclaimed a page earlier. It is, of course, tempting to entrust to capitalism the "dirty work" of preparing the conditions for the transition to a new social arrangement. But will the peoples of the developing countries agree in the name of economic growth (resulting for them in increased social inequality) to be quietly pulverized in the millstones of capitalist exploitation and are they prepared to reconcile themselves to the modern modifications of "enclosure," "blood law" and so forth, that is, the forms of progress likened by K. Marx to that "repulsive pagan idol who had no desire to drink nectar other than from the skulls of the dead" (1, vol 9, p 230)?

But V.L. Sheynis himself even recognizes the "resistance of the traditional environment" and the "stimulation here of conflict potential," which entails "a threat to state unity, the integrity of historically inadequately welded social organisms" and so forth. Such negative phenomena can only be averted, he believes, on the "difficult path of the formation and implantation here of the democratic structures and institutions of civic society" (ibid.). In this connection V.L. Sheynis deems it essential "to take the next step" (p 79) on from the "reevaluation" begun by the 27th CPSU Congress and recognize that "democracy is not only an instrument contributing to the achievement of this goal of society or the other but also a priority social value in itself" (p 87). However, this formulation of the question would not seem legitimate in either a historical or contemporary context if only for the reason that in literally the next sentence the author practically places on a single level "all" forms of democracy, including, it has to be assumed, both bourgeois and socialist. There is no need to quote here, say, the well-known propositions of V.I. Lenin's report on bourgeois democracy at the First Comintern Congress but we simply cannot overlook V.L. Sheynis' unsubstantiated interpretation of the propositions of Lenin's well-known article "On the Significance of Gold Now and Following the Complete Victory of Socialism". Cautioning against the use of violence by the developing countries' forces of the left, he virtually equates this concept with the "revolutionary character" and "revolutionary methods" concepts employed by V.I. Lenin (p 88). Does it not thus transpire that on the pretence of violence revolutionary means are being expelled from the modern class struggle or, in other words, the baby is being thrown out with the bath water?

The following quotation from the publication in question may serve as one further example of its typical estrangement of theoretical calculations from practical recommendations. "Of course," V.L. Sheynis observes, "even in the developing countries in which they have come to be firmly established democratic standards and institutions have yet to sink sufficiently deep and strong roots. Development based on the consensus of all political forces not going beyond the framework of democratic 'rules of the game' as yet lacks lengthy historical

traditions.... But under modern conditions... it is important to keep these exacerbations within the bounds of civilized social behavior. And not only because this will facilitate the developing countries' movement onto the democratic highways of history—any internal conflict could easily become internationalized" (pp 87-88). It is difficult to resist the temptation to illustrate the adduced ideas with an idyllic picture: Ayatollah Khomeini and Shah Mohammed Reza in Iran, representatives of the Sikh separatists and the central government of India and figures of the apartheid regime and leaders of the black majority of South Africa sitting down at the negotiating table and in the name of preventing the internationalization of the corresponding internal conflicts discussing in an atmosphere of fraternal mutual understanding not "their allegedly more important tasks of national development" (p 87) but "democratic 'rules of the game'... within the bounds of civilized social behavior" (c).

Let us not, however, speak for the author, who offers his own solutions "in the broader context of the new vision of world problems." In this connection he emphasizes the USSR's readiness for a lowering of the level of military confrontation and notes that socialist revolution in the developed capitalist countries is a question of the very distant future and that in the foreseeable future the unity of the world "may and will be" realized within the framework of the "cooperation" of the different socio-economic systems and that the "barrier" between the communist parties and social democrats "does not today seem as insurmountable as was the case recently." Under these conditions, V.L. Sheynis believes, there arises the possibility of ensuring movement toward a new world economic order "based on the consensus of the main parties concerned," ascertaining and actively shaping zones of the concurrence of East-West interests in the South and of imparting an increasingly firm and diversified nature to relations along North-South lines. For this it is essential, he believes, to formulate a calmer and more balanced analysis of the sum total of relations along North-South lines, take into consideration the sensitivity of the West's public opinion to USSR policy, develop dialectical approaches to the role of the TNC in the "third world," evaluate the known progressive possibilities contained in the capitalist development of countries which have lagged behind and so forth (pp 88-89).

Were it not for the author's political prescriptions examined earlier, some of these propositions could be taken as the result of a vision of world problems ahead of its time. However, in the overall context of a publication not containing a class analysis of the actual means of achievement of the set goals they appear as no more than pious wishes. This fact would seem to have been recognized by V.L. Sheynis also. The proposition concluding his publication reads: "Anticipating possible objections that the author is presenting pious wishes which fail to take into consideration today's political realities, evolved relations and the persistence of settled orientations and processes, three final remarks must be made"

(p 89). But none of these three remarks are geared to cogently forestalling "possible objections" to the "pious wishes" but merely at proving the need to "broaden" the conception and methodology of the new political thinking from the author's own conceptual-procedural principles and thereby substantiating the legitimacy of the advancement of these same pious wishes.

Without setting ourselves the excessive task of solving the main theoretical problems of oriental studies and not venturing to predict the prospects of the development of the emergent countries in all the diversity of specific manifestations, let us examine certain questions of the bourgeois transformation of these countries and the paths of their further progressive movement which it has brought about.

It is generally recognized that the problem of development has in recent times been the most universal feature of the emergent states. The vast majority of them has, as V.L. Sheynis rightly observed, been pulled into the process of capitalist evolution, "and the prospects of the solution of many economic and even social problems—regardless of whether this is proclaimed openly or not—are linked with the capitalist transformation of the economy, which is gaining momentum and extending in breadth and in depth" (p 79), and, what is more, the said transformation "is frequently assuming unusual, 'non-classical' forms" (p 80). It is for this reason that the perfectly justified characterization of the "third world" as a zone of "belated," "late" and "peripheral" capitalism is becoming established increasingly firmly in oriental studies.

The specific features of the capitalist evolution of the developing countries are manifested most strikingly in the above-mentioned economic and, particularly, social state of disintegration of the modern and traditional sectors and structures. Practically no one disputes this fact. A point of disagreement may be discerned merely in respect of the evaluation of the essence and degree of the said state of disintegration. The latter, V.L. Sheynis believes, represents "not only a serious obstacle in the way of economic growth and social progress but also an indicator of the renewal of society which is under way" (p 86). Possibly. But I believe that a distinctive form of integration of the modern and traditional sectors and structures also has to be seen in their disintegration. It is this which imparts to the situation which has taken shape in the "third world" a historically unprecedented nature.

Is the complete surmounting of the existing gap between these sectors and structures (and, consequently, their interaction which has evolved on this basis) possible on the tracks of capitalism—this is a question to which social practice has not yet given a conclusive answer. The reason for "the incapacity of the traditional social and political structures, which are modernizing very slowly, for coping with the realities of our era" lies, obviously, not only in the "social environment" of the developing



countries, which is "adapting capitalism for its preservation," and not, of course, in the *immanent* (my italics—S.A.) contradictions of capitalism... which has not known how to transform or has simply adapted to this environment" (p 79). After all, there was a time in the history of the bourgeoisie about which the founders of Marxism wrote: "On pain of ruin it forces all nations to adopt the bourgeois mode of production and forces them to introduce in their countries so-called civilization, that is, to become bourgeois" (1, vol 4, p 428). True, in this case it was mainly a question of European countries, but acknowledgment of the constructive possibilities of the capitalism of the mid-19th century which had made it capable of transforming the traditional sectors and structures in accordance with its image and likeness has also to be seen here.

Under the conditions of *contemporary* capitalism, however, not constructive but destructive and not transforming but decaying functions come to the fore. It is not fortuitous that the capitalist development of the majority of emergent countries—granted all the changes in the social strategy of colonialism and neocolonialism—is occurring not so much via the bourgeois transformation of the traditional foundations, traditional enterprise and the growth of other internal prerequisites as via the implantation "from the top" of the latest monopoly and state-monopoly structures holding back the extensive and mass development of capitalism "from below". It is most likely this which is causing the sharp discrepancy between the modern and traditional sectors, the relative socioeconomic disjunctive condition and the perfectly definite state of sociopolitical disintegration of the social and economic structures corresponding thereto. Whence the acute confrontation of the socio-class forces supporting them which erupts from time to time. As practice shows, the traditional environment frequently resists here not modernization as such but the forms of its implementation in which the antagonistic nature of capitalism's use of the laws of modern production is manifested particularly clearly.

Undoubtedly, a certain lessening of the backwardness of the developing world is possible on the paths of capitalist development also. Turning to the following statement by V.I. Lenin on the Stolypin campaign is not without interest in this connection: "It is an avowedly landowner program. But can it be said that it is reactionary in the economic sense, that is, that it precludes or endeavors to preclude the development of capitalism and prevent bourgeois agrarian revolution? Not at all.... It is proceeding, beyond all doubt, along the lines of capitalist evolution, facilitating and pushing forward this evolution and accelerating the expropriation of the peasantry... and the creation of a peasant bourgeoisie.

"Does this mean that the social democrats should 'support' it? No. Only vulgar Marxism could reason thus.... In the name of the interests of the development of the productive forces (this highest criterion of social

progress) we must support not a bourgeois evolution of a landowner type but a bourgeois revolution of the peasant type" (2, vol 16, pp 219-220).

The methodological significance of the statement quoted goes far beyond the framework of the need to distinguish between two types of bourgeois evolution. Under current conditions it may and must no longer be a question of bourgeois evolution of the peasant type but of ways of social transformation alternative to capitalism. And under these conditions also particular importance is attached to the fact that V.I. Lenin linked the interests of the development of the productive forces as the highest criterion of social progress with the interests of the majority of the population. For he considered mankind's highest goal the development of production relations as a process of a deepening of socioeconomic equality. And since the economic mechanism of capitalism provides for social progress only by way of "an acceleration of social contrasts and society's disintegration," the need for the search for a different, democratic alternative is preserved all the more.

In fact, should we, "soberly" evaluating problems of the "third world" (p 82), be supporting there the interests of capitalist development, not to mention such direct or indirect recommendations? Of course, the question of the "significant load" accruing to the most developed socialist countries is quite serious. But, as V.I. Lenin observed, "there can be no arguing the fact that the proletariat of the foremost countries can and must help the backward working masses and that the development of the backward countries may emerge from its present phase when the victorious proletariat of the Soviet republics stretches out a hand to these masses and renders them support" (2, vol 41, p 246). It is merely a question, obviously, of how the said assistance and support should be expressed.

The unreadiness of the vast majority of developing countries for direct transition to socialism and the difficulty and, at times, impossibility of realization of the noncapitalist path idea are by no means sufficient grounds for recommending that they, for a start, be rendered down in the kettle of capitalism, undergo the complete school of capitalist training in the economic, political and socio-cultural plane and only then look for the way toward a new social arrangement. Specific historical practice has already shown us repeatedly examples of development per the "reverse circuit," and V.I. Lenin's polemic with N. Sukhanov concerning revolution in our country (2, vol 45, pp 378-382) is too well known for it to be retold here. The above-mentioned circumstances demand not the abandonment of the search for opportunities for the developing countries "for considerably shortening their negotiation of the phase of capitalism, which is now becoming inevitable," and "for considerably shortening the process of their development in the direction of a socialist society" (1, vol 22, pp 435, 445-446) but the finding of means

adequate to the conditions of place and time, "that is, upholding revolutionary interests in a way such as corresponds to the changed circumstances" (1, vol 31, p 438).

Decisive significance in this respect is attached, it would seem, to the further creative development and improvement of the concept being elaborated by the developing countries' communist parties of national-democratic revolution with the prospect of transition to socialism. This concept is in terms of its content sufficiently broad as to encompass the entire diversity of the objective conditions which have taken shape in the "third world," including the as yet preserved rare possibility of a noncapitalist path. True, the communist party of such a developed capitalist country as Japan also describes the impending revolution as democratic, anti-imperialist and antimonopoly, but this may be seen as further evidence of the breadth of this concept.

(The question currently being discussed in oriental literature concerning the growth of a national-democratic revolution into a popular-democratic revolution is to a certain extent of an artificial nature, we believe. It arose partly as a reaction of scholars—by way of self-justification—to the failures of the ideas of noncapitalist development in countries in which the declaration of the corresponding choice had occurred within the framework of the "national socialisms" ideology (Iraq, Syria and others), failures which brought about the need to separate these countries from the so-called "second echelon" revolutionary-democratic regimes, which had made the same choice on the basis of assimilation of Marxist-Leninist theory (Ethiopia, Angola, the PDRY and others). If we turn to the experience of postwar revolutions in the East European countries, where the revolutionary phenomenon of the second of the above-mentioned types first emerged, the "national-democratic revolution" definition employed in the CSSR in itself testifies that both the said types of revolution pertain to a phenomenon of a single type. It is indicative that the definition of the April 1978 revolution in Afghanistan as national-democratic has by no means prevented characterization of the new authorities [and the party structure] as popular-democratic.

As far as the essence of the national-democratic revolution concept itself is concerned, it should be noted first of all here that the movement of this revolution beyond the framework of capitalism is not ensured automatically. Actual social practice of recent decades has shown that it may come to a stop at the stage of bourgeois-democratic development (even given a certain "running ahead"). It all depends on which sociopolitical forces are at the head of the national-democratic struggle. The problem of revolutionary democracy merits new and more in-depth discussion in this connection. It would seem that in the most developed emergent countries its role now may be performed only by proletarian democracy together with its allies (which, of course, does not signify the presence right now of all conditions for the practical realization of this role).

Importance for the further theoretical development and improvement of the national-democratic revolution concept is attached to the consideration of all past revolutionary experience. The deliberate exclusion of all violence from the means of struggle of the exploited is tantamount to calls to the exploiters to voluntarily yield up their power and property, not to mention encouragement of the latter to repressive-punitive actions, in response to which, as a rule, revolutionary violence is actually employed. That under current conditions, when the very existence of mankind is at stake, the revolutionary forces of each country are confronted particularly acutely with the task of recognition of their responsibility for the means they employ, when choosing which the situation on the world scene has to be taken into consideration, is another matter. At the same time, as M.S. Gorbachev observed in answers to questions from the L'UNITA editorial office, "powerful political and legal mechanisms of controlling international relations" capable of preventing the internationalization of internal conflicts "must be created and must function" (5, 20 May 1987).

Speaking of revolution, nor is it possible to disregard the opportunities, which have increased sharply under current conditions, of the use reforms determined by the further enrichment of their content and social functions. It is in this respect that abundant food for thought is provided by the above-mentioned article of V.I. Lenin "The Significance of Gold Now and Following the Complete Victory of Socialism". He wrote, *inter alia*: "Following the victory of the proletariat, if only in one country, there is something new in the attitude of reforms toward revolution. Things remain the same in principle, but there is a change in form." And he hereupon added that on an international scale (and not for the country of victorious revolution) reforms continue to be a "byproduct" of revolutionary class struggle (2, vol 44, p 228).

Does reform remain under the present conditions of the changed correlation of forces in the world arena a "by-product" of revolutionary class struggle on an international scale? The answer to this question can no longer be unequivocal, I believe. Take, for example, the problem of a new world economic order. This would undoubtedly be a reform inasmuch as the corresponding order would not in itself change the fundamental social essence of the modern contradictory and interdependent world. And it would undoubtedly be a "by-product" of international class struggle ultimately aimed at a fundamental restructuring of the entire system of world social relations on a social basis common to all mankind. However, we cannot confine ourselves to what has been said since it is a question of an independent stage of this struggle and the intermediate task thereof whose accomplishment today would suit the vast majority of states and peoples. In addition, the creation of a new world economic order would prove to be the radical measure following whose implementation the social system currently countering it would start to become its opposite

(albeit in the sense in which imperialism is the opposite of premonopoly capitalism), and reform could have a revolutionary denouement.

The application of new aspects of the general historical problem of the correlation of reform and revolution to the conditions of individual countries prompts us to recall, if we permit ourselves to dream a little about the distant future, with what attention V.I. Lenin formerly treated K. Marx's idea concerning the likelihood of the "peaceful" victory of socialism by way of the "paying off" of the bourgeoisie (1, vol 22, p 523) or, as he observed, the "redemption" of the bourgeoisie by the workers (2, vol 36, p 304). Somewhat later V.I. Lenin himself wrote about the possibility of a slight opportunity of "the peaceful evolution of capitalism in the direction of the new system" arising, although he observed that we, "as communists, have no great belief in this, but are agreeable to help put this to the test and consider it our duty" (2, vol 44, p 407). Such a possibility could be realized on the basis of a qualitatively new type of "revolution from the top" differing appreciably from all previously known forms of sociopolitical changes. But the preparations for such a development cannot, of course, be postponed.

M.S. Gorbachev's report at the joint ceremonial session of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Great October observed: "An influence on objective processes in support of peace will be exerted by the class struggle and other manifestations of social contradictions.... Granted all the might of transnational capital, it will not determine the paths of the movement of the 'third world' but, rather, will itself be forced to adapt to the independent choice which has been made or will be made by the peoples themselves. And they and the organizations representing them have a vital interest in a new world economic order.... Indeed, the greatness and novelty of our time is that the peoples are increasingly manifestly and openly present at the forefront of history. They now have positions which enable them to compel recognition not ultimately but immediately. A new truth is thereby shining through also: permanent choice is becoming more characteristic of the movement of history on the boundary of the 20th and 21st centuries. And the soundness thereof will depend on how and to what extent the interests and intentions of millions and hundreds of millions are taken into consideration" (5, 3 November 1987).

Anticipating the possible reaction of some readers to this article, I would like to make three final remarks.

First, the author of these lines is perfectly well aware that the position which he has been upholding could appear to be a manifestation of "conservatism and undue cautiousness," against which the publication in question warns (pp 89-90). But he, for his part, believes the main

thing to be avoiding a situation in which attempts at a "revolutionary" reconsideration of all aspects of revolutionary theory are reflected most disastrously in revolutionary practice.

Second, when preparing the article, the author proceeded from the fact that the distinguishing feature of the new policy of the CPSU is its "long-term, fundamental nature and orientation toward long-term goals and not current market conditions and partners' immediate reactions" (p 90). It is for this reason that what would seem most important to him is not the fact that "significant numbers of the political establishment of the West are starting to change their attitude toward our country" (ibid.) but that no detachment of the international revolutionary movement interpret the new political thinking such that ultimate goals are lost sight of in the *struggle* for the accomplishment of current tasks.

Third, the author does not place his article on either side of the "precise boundary between scientific publications and those reflecting the official position" which V.L. Sheynis suggests be drawn (ibid.). For he believes that under the conditions of the policy adopted by the CPSU of an expansion of democracy and glasnost there should be no in any way abrupt divide between them and that "an uncompromising comparison of different viewpoints in the course of scientific discussion may lead to a comprehension of the entire set of problems posed by life" (ibid.) only given compliance by all its participants with the fundamental demands of social dialectics (for more detail see [6]).

#### Footnotes

a. The article continues the discussion begun by V.L. Sheynis' publication. See RK i SM No 4, 1987. There are further references to this publication in the text.

b. "Marxism teaches," V.I. Lenin wrote, "that a society based on commodity production which is involved in exchange with civilized capitalist nations itself also at a certain level of development inevitably embarks on the path of capitalism" (2, vol 11, p 37).

c. "It is ridiculous to think," V.I. Lenin wrote, "in war and for war an agreement 'pertaining to form' is required: choice of representatives, a meeting, the signing of a treaty, appointment of the day and hour!... An agreement concerning revolutionary actions... is practicable **only** by force of the **example** of serious revolutionary actions, a **start** thereon and the **development** thereof" (2, vol 26, pp 288-289).

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works".

2. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works".

3. "Material of the 27th CPSU Congress," Moscow, 1986.

4. "Material of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum. 25-26 June 1987". Moscow, 1987.

5. PRAVDA.

6. R. Avakov, "The New Thinking and the Problem of Study of the Developing Countries" in MEMO No 11, 1987.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1987

8850

### **Taiwan's Economic Development, Working Class Activity Viewed**

18070061b Moscow *RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR* in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 87 (signed to press 18 Nov 87) pp 140-144

[Article by Viktoriya Alekseyevna Sycheva, scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD: "Taiwan: Economic Development and the Working Class"]

[Text] The intensification of the uneven development of countries within the capitalist system is leading to the formation of new economic and political centers of rivalry. Pertaining to these in the Asia-Pacific region are Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong and Singapore. Bourgeois specialists consider the accelerated capitalist transformation of certain countries and territories of Asia an "economic miracle," and their development model based on foreign investments, export orientation and comparatively cheap skilled manpower is a standard for emergent states (1). However, the social contradictions arising in the course of this evolution in the new industrial countries and territories have been little studied or studied not at all. An analysis of the development trends of the growing working class and the dynamics of its structure is essential.

The most appreciable quantitative and qualitative changes in Taiwan's working class in the 1970's-1980's make it possible to ascertain important shifts in the economic and social sphere which have occurred not only on this island but in the region also. In this period the economic growth rate has on Taiwan been one of the highest in the world and has constituted on average approximately 10 percent per annum, whereas the rate of growth of the population, only 2 percent per annum approximately. Per capita GNP has more than doubled and amounted to \$3,144 in 1985. The ratio of the sizes of the per capita GNP of the wealthiest 20 percent and the poorest 20 percent of the island's population has in recent years assumed a stable nature here: in 1979 and 1985 this ratio was 4:1 (2).

In the last decade recessions and the closure of enterprises were observed in 1974-1975 and 1979-1983 and also in 1985-1986.

There has been a change in the structure of Taiwan's economy. Whereas in 1971 the proportion of the industrial product in the GNP amounted to 35 percent, and that of the farm product, to 19 percent, in 1985 the figures were 50 and 6 percent respectively (3). The role of the industrial product in Taiwan's export structure has grown. In 1971 industrial products constituted 81 percent of exports, but in the mid-1980's, 86 percent. Taiwan now maintains diplomatic relations with only 22 states, but trades with 140.

The export orientation of many sectors of Taiwan's industry is contributing to ensuring that ever increasing significance in the island's economy is attached to the large-scale capitalist enterprises which are competitive on the international market. The biggest enterprises on Taiwan are considered those with more than 100 employees. In the 1970's-1980's the number of such enterprises in manufacturing industry almost doubled (4.6 percent in 1971, 8.7 percent in 1980) (4).

A particular feature of Taiwan's enterprises is their family character. A small or medium-sized enterprise is usually headed by the head of the family. As before, the founders of the majority of major companies remain their managers and coowners, and many management positions are held by members of their families. The government encourages the amalgamation of small and medium-sized companies by way of the granting of loans; tax and customs privileges have been introduced for the coowners of merged enterprises.

The government has a big part in the formation and development of capitalism. It actively influences the island's economy, controlling economic life and business activity. Although the proportion of the industrial product produced at state-owned enterprises is gradually declining (from 67 percent in 1952 to 23 percent in 1980) (5), the significance of the public sector is great in the power engineering, petroleum and petrochemical, steel and shipbuilding sectors of industry and in sugar and fertilizer production. The public sector consists of approximately 140 enterprises united in 12 corporations.

A source of the financing of Taiwan's industrial development is incoming capital in the form of borrowing and direct investments from various countries. The sum total of direct foreign capital investments in the period from 1952 through 1984 constituted approximately \$4.5 billion. The main investors were Chinese living overseas (32 percent), the United States (30 percent) and Japan (17 percent). The foreign capital was channeled mainly into the electronic and electrical engineering, chemical and machine-building sectors of industry working for export. In the period 1973-1980 some 10 percent of total capital in manufacturing industry was invested by foreign firms (6).

On the frontier of the 1970's-1980's Taiwan had 855 enterprises belonging wholly or partially to foreign companies. They accounted for 8.7 percent of GNP and 28.4 percent of Taiwan's exports. For the attraction of capital foreign stock markets are accorded big privileges: tax exemption, 100-percent property ownership, complete disposal of profits and so forth. In 1985 Taiwan's foreign debt constituted approximately \$7 billion or 12 percent of GNP, and for this reason part of the island's budget is being spent on the payment of interest and the paying off of the debt.

In turn, Taiwanese businessmen are investing capital overseas, mainly in the United States and the ASEAN countries (7). In 1986 the total amount thereof constituted \$57 million.

The island's industrial enterprises are located in industrial districts and "free trade zones" which have been created by the state, through which raw material and semimanufactures are imported duty-free and finished products are exported. There is a large number of foreign firms on the territory of the zones. Some 263 enterprises with 77,000 employees were operating in three "free trade zones" in 1985.

In the 1980's the Taiwanese authorities have embarked on the creation of a "science and industry park" 70 km south of the capital. The scientific and production facilities on the grounds of the "park" are earmarked for foreign firms, where local companies familiarize themselves with the new technology. A number of foreign companies have opened affiliates. It is planned that the "park" will annually play host to approximately 15 foreign firms and that by 1990 the number thereof will have risen to 150-200, and the number of employees, to 30,000-40,000 (8).

The capitalist transformation of agriculture on Taiwan began simultaneously with the development of industry. Implementation of the 1949-1953 agrarian reform, when government-owned and manorial land was sold to tenants, contributed to an upturn in agricultural production. True, a trend toward recession showed through in agriculture in the latter half of the 1960's: the rate of agricultural development slowed owing to the allotment type of land tenure impeding the introduction of modern equipment and technology. By 1980 approximately 85 percent of cultivated land belonged to small farmers. Of the 872,267 families living in rural localities, 43.1 percent owned plots of less than half a hectare, and 2.6 percent, of more than 3 hectares (9; p 129).

For the more efficient use of plowland the government has embarked in the 1980's on implementation of the second stage of the agrarian reform: measures are being adopted to consolidate the holdings of proprietors living fully or predominantly by rural labor, and cooperatives are being created in such forms as the joint cultivation of the land, marketing and supply and such.

The capitalist modernization of the economy and the rapid industrial development of Taiwan have brought about a change in its social character. There has been a change in the employment structure thanks to the reduction in the agricultural population in favor of the secondary and tertiary sectors of the economy. In Taiwanese statistics agriculture, forestry and fishing pertain to the primary sector, extractive and manufacturing industry, construction, electric power engineering and gas and water supply, to the secondary, and trade, transport, warehousing, communications and services, to the tertiary sector. From 1971 through 1980 the primary sector declined by 388,000, while the secondary and tertiary sectors increased by 1.339 million and 858,000 persons respectively. Taiwan's working class has grown to a considerable extent thanks to the urban nonproletarian strata and also the rural population. New trends had come to light at the start of the 1980's in the development of the three sectors of the economy: employment had stabilized in the primary sector, and at the same time a redistribution has been under way of those employed in the secondary and tertiary sectors. The number of sales and office personnel and people working in services is, accordingly, increasing more rapidly.

The change in the sectoral and occupational structure of employment has been connected with the migration of rural inhabitants to the cities and the growth of the urban population. The numbers of Taiwan's five biggest cities—Taipei, Kaohsiung, Taitung, Tainan and Chilung—grew from 3.8 million in 1970 to 5.2 million in 1981 or from 26.2 percent to 27.8 percent of the population, and the proportion of townspeople constituted by the mid-1980's approximately 70 percent of the population. There are fewer unemployed on Taiwan than in the industrially developed capitalist countries, however, in the crisis years the number thereof amounted to 200,000 (2.7 percent of the economically active population) (10). There was a growth in hidden unemployment here.

In terms of the proportion of wage workers in the overall numbers of the economically active population Taiwan has far outpaced the majority of emergent countries, although lags behind the developed capitalist countries. From 1972 through 1981 the numbers of Taiwan's wage workers increased from 2.7 million to 4.3 million or from 54.6 to 63.7 percent. The proportion of people working for wages is particularly high among those employed in power engineering (100 percent), extractive and manufacturing industry (95.3 and 88.4 percent) and construction (91.3 percent); it is somewhat less in transport (84.7 percent), in services (82.8 percent) and in banking (81.5 percent). There is a high percentage in agriculture of independent (50.4 percent) and unpaid family workers (31.8 percent), and in trade, of independent workers (41.8 percent).

Under the conditions of S&T progress the development of capitalist production relations is leading to an expansion of the social base of the working class. On the one hand there is a movement of the "upper limit" of the

proletariat thanks to the mass increase in the number of "border" occupations. In terms of living conditions substantial numbers of the lowest groups of office workers are ceasing to differ from industrial workers. The wage levels of the lowest groups of employees and workers are converging; the types of their labor are becoming more alike. The "lower limit" of the proletariat is moving also: precapitalist structures are gradually being superseded, and a transition from the lowest to the highest forms of capitalist production is taking place. More than one-third of Taiwan's workers are persons who have been working for less than 10 years, and pronounced numbers of them are first-generation workers.

The working class is subdivided into industrial, agricultural and commercial-office. More than half of it is composed of the industrial proletariat: workers of extractive and manufacturing industry, power, gas and water supply and construction and transport workers; significant groups of the proletariat are concentrated in textile industry and machine building, chemical and petrochemical industry, electrical engineering and electronics. Employment in these most modern sectors, the textile sector excepted, has grown at a preferential rate in the 1970's-1980's (11). Approximately two-thirds of Taiwan's factory and plant proletariat works at modern large-scale capitalist enterprises. The rest are employed at smaller enterprises of a capitalist type or represent the semiproletariat of the crafts-manufacturing type (12).

The wage workers of manufacturing industry are employed in the private sector, in the main. Some 105,000 and 325,000 persons respectively or one-fourth of workers of manufacturing industry worked at enterprises belonging to state-owned and foreign firms at the start of the 1980's. More than one-fourth of the working class is composed of commercial-office personnel and also people working in services, and their numbers have been growing rapidly in recent years. Agricultural workers constitute the remainder of the working class; they work at state-owned cane sugar plantations and are employed in temporary work and day laboring on private farms. Many of them cultivate their small plots of land. The numbers of the agricultural proletariat are declining constantly.

Although there is a trend toward the convergence of these three groups, differences among them persist in level of education and financial situation. According to surveys conducted in the period 1978-1983 by the Executive Yuan's Research, Development and Assessment Commission, wage workers attribute themselves, in the main, to the so-called "middle classes" or middle "strata" (13). Such self-evaluation is particularly characteristic of employees or the commercial-office proletariat, to a lesser extent, of the industrial proletariat.

A growth is being observed with the development of industry and the appearance of new modern sectors in the skills of the Taiwanese proletariat; the general level

of education of the population has risen and the network of vocational-technical schools and training centers has expanded. At the start of the 1980's some 4.5 percent of workers were illiterate, 47.9 percent had elementary education and 43.2 percent had secondary and secondary specialized education (14). The largest number of illiterates was recorded among those employed in agriculture, while commercial-office personnel had the highest level of education.

Under the conditions of the world crisis of the first half of the 1970's the competitiveness of Taiwan's industry was secured at a price of the working people's unstable living conditions. By the start of the 1980's the growth of real wages in manufacturing industry had reached zero almost, productivity having risen at a preferential rate here, which testified to a relative deterioration in the positions of the Taiwanese proletariat. In 1986 a person working in manufacturing industry received on average \$380 per month or approximately one-fifth of the American and Japanese worker's monthly wage.

There are differences in the wage level depending on the sector of the economy, the size of the enterprise and the form of ownership of the enterprises and also the skills of the workers and their sex and age. Rural workers are in the most difficult position (15). In the nonagricultural sectors of the economy the lowest wages are received by people working in manufacturing industry, in which the private sector is predominant. The difference in the pay of workers of the biggest and smallest enterprises here constitutes 38 percent. Line workers receive more than handymen, but half as much as engineers. In power engineering, gas and water supply and extractive industry and transport, that is, the sectors in which state-owned enterprises are predominant, wages are higher than at private enterprises of manufacturing industry. People working in foreign enterprises of electronics, plastics and machine-building industry receive even more. The wages of persons working in commerce are close on average to those of production workers.

Equal pay for men and women is proclaimed by Taiwan's laws, but women receive half as much as men for the same work (16).

Making concessions to the unions' demands, the Kuomintang authorities are taking certain steps to revise labor laws, but, as before, different groups of the working class enjoy dissimilar rights. For example, in accordance with the law on "labor standards," the shortest—44 hours—work week has been established for office workers or white-collar workers in industrial sectors. For blue-collar workers in extractive and manufacturing industry, construction, power engineering, gas and water supply, transport and communications it amounts to 48 hours. The law does not extend to those working in services (17).

Approximately one-third of persons employed in manufacturing industry frequently works a 50-59-, and some, a more than 60-hour week. Despite the Labor Safety Act, there is a great number of accidents at work. From 1976 through 1980 accident mortality on Taiwan was one of the highest in the world—0.6 per 1,000, that is, eight times higher than in Great Britain, for example (18).

The right of workers to associate in unions is limited. It is not enjoyed by persons working in military industry and nonproduction workers of state-owned enterprises. The right to collective action provided by labor legislation exists only on paper since the law governing a state of emergency has since 1949 (since 1987, the National Security Act) banned strikes and mass meetings. War-time courts—tribunals which are under the jurisdiction of the command of the Taiwan Garrison—the main organ of repression on the island—operate.

Brutal suppression of any opposition has secured the lengthy existence on Taiwan of the virtually one-party rule of the Kuomintang Party. The Democratic Socialist and Young China parties are extremely small and receive from Kuomintang funds "subsidies" for "anticommunist propaganda". Only in December 1986, on the eve of partial elections to the central authorities, was the opposition Progressive Democratic Party, which united the professional classes and part of Taiwan's petty and middle bourgeoisie, created.

The working class does not have a party of its own. The unions are the sole organization of the working people. The number of union members had grown from 600,000 in 1971 to 1.3 million by 1986 or from 12 to 17 percent of the economically active population. In the past 15 years the rate of increase in union membership has been approximately half the relative increase in the working class.

Taiwan's unions are influenced by the aggressive anti-communist thrust of the policy of the Taiwanese Government. Trade union activity, like, incidentally, all social, economic and political life on the island, is controlled by the Kuomintang via state and party authorities. The government may approve or prohibit the creation of a union and also dissolve an operating union. The unions receive subsidies from the state. The Kuomintang Central Committee Fifth Department deals with labor problems and implements a program of the "political education" of union leaders. All union organizations have to register with the Ministry of the Interior. They are obliged to report on the membership, finances, elections and other matters. The unions' organizational structure is, in particular, characteristic. They belong to the Chinese Labor Federation (CLF), which is intended allegedly to represent the interests of "all of China," and the Taiwan Labor Federation (TLF). The working people united in unions are split into two groups, whose sphere of activity is not always clearly defined, which frequently causes disagreements and rivalry between them. The CLF maintains relations with the reformist ICFTU, of

which it is a member. The TFL is formally an affiliate of the CLF. It incorporates union sectoral federations and also city and district unions (19); it deals predominantly with organizational matters, at election time, for example.

Some 4,500 charities, whose funds are formed from contributions from the workers themselves and also subsidies from the state and businessmen, have been created with the unions' participation at many enterprises to prevent labor conflicts (20). The funds are managed by special committees, two-thirds of which are composed of union representatives. The union leadership pursues a policy of "social peace," the basis of which are Confucian moral and ethical rules and traditions.

It is not surprising that in the eyes of the working people the unions appear merely as an instrument of control and not a support in the business of an improvement in living conditions. It is well known that even wages are determined exclusively by management, the unions in the majority of cases, on the other hand, taking no part in labor negotiations (21). Naturally, the workers are refusing to join unions wholly subordinate to the authorities. An upsurge in the assertiveness of the working class, in the period 1979-1983, for example, is manifested in periods of recession. This, specifically, may be judged from the growth in the number of labor conflicts which affected both large and small companies and the numbers of the participants. Whereas by the start of the 1970's some 79 labor conflicts, in which 1,064 persons participated, had been logged, by 1980 the number of labor conflicts and the number of their participants had increased to 700 and 5,990 respectively, and by 1982, to 1,300 and 9,000 persons (22). This was over twice as many as at the time of the 1974-1975 crisis. In reality the scale of the protests is probably more extensive: labor conflicts are rarely illustrated in the Taiwan press. However, under conditions of repression even small conflicts, in which no more than 10-15 persons take part on average, may serve to indicate acute confrontations.

In the main, Taiwan's working people are struggling for higher wages and against dismissal and seeking compensation payments. They are resorting to veiled forms of struggle: refusing to perform this job or the other, arranging to take simultaneous leave and sick leave and so forth (23).

Thus the industrial evolution, which has been realized at an accelerated pace, has contributed to the rapid involvement of the traditional social structures in the orbit of capitalist production relations. In the 1970's-1980's the proletariat has become the most populous class of Taiwanese society. It is young and socially heterogeneous; the process of its formation is not complete, and it possesses considerable potential for conversion into an independent political force.

Footnotes

1. See E.K.Y. Chen, "Hyper-Growth in Asia Economies: A Comparative Study of Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Singapore and Taiwan," London, 1979; "Growth Distribution and Social Change: Essays of the Economy of the Republic of China," Baltimore, 1978; "Economic Growth and Structural Change in Taiwan: the Postwar Experience of the Republic of China," London, 1979; "Contemporary Republic of China. The Taiwan Experience (1950-1980)," New York, 1981.

2. THE ECONOMIST, London, 1982, vol 284, No 7248, pp 3, 8; FREE CHINA REVIEW (FCR) No 9, 1985, Taipei, p 25; THE FREE CHINA JOURNAL (FCJ), vol 4, No 5, Taipei, 19187, p 4.

3. "China Yearbook 1978," Taipei, 1978, pp 177, 210;; FCJ, vol 3, No 4, 1986, Taipei, p 1.

4. S.P.S. Ho, "Economic Development of Taiwan 1860-1970," New Haven and London, 1978, p 378; FCR, vol 30, No 10, 1980, Taipei, p 40.

5. "China Yearbook," 1977, Taipei, p 180; QUARTERLY ECONOMIC REVIEW OF TAIWAN, Annual Supplement, Taipei, 1982, p 10.

6. "Contemporary Republic of China. The Taiwan Experience 1950-1980," New York, 1981, p 192; QUARTERLY ECONOMIC REVIEW No 3, 1985, London.

7. FCJ, vol 4, No 2, 1987, Taipei, p 4.

8. FREE CHINA WEEKLY (FCW), vol 24, No 44, Taipei, 1983, p 4.

9. "Statistical Yearbook of the Republic of China," 1981, Taipei, p 129.

10. ZHONGGUO TONGJI NIANJIAN, Beijing, 1985, p 64.

11. "Statistical Yearbook of the Republic of China," Taipei, 1981, pp 70-85, 94; "The Working Class in the Social Structure of Industrially Developed Capitalist Countries," Moscow, 1977, pp 311-312.

12. See S.P.S. Ho, "Economic Development of Taiwan, 1860-1970," New Haven and London, 1978, p 378.

13. FCJ, vol 3, No 2, Taipei, 1986, p 3.

14. "Education in the Republic of China," Taipei, p 29; "Statistical Yearbook of the Republic of China," Taipei, 1981, pp 16-17, 66; FCJ, vol 4, No 5, 1987, Taipei, p 4; vol 3, No 40, 1986, p 1.

15. FCW, vol 20, No 47, 1979, Taipei, p 4.

16. "Economic Growth and Structural Change in Taiwan: the Postwar Experience of the Republic of China," London, 1979, p 417; "The Taiwan Success Story: Rapid Growth With Improved Distribution in the Republic of China," Boulder, Colorado, 1981, p 105.

17. FCJ, vol 1, No 25, 1984, Taipei, p 1; No 28, p 3; No 29, p 1.

18. FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC REVIEW (FEER), vol 115, No 9, 1984, Hong Kong, p 79.

19. "Labor Law and Practice in the Republic of China (Taiwan)," Washington, 1972, p 35.

20. "Trade Unions of the World," Moscow, 1980, p 203.

21. FEER, Hong Kong, 1986, vol 132, No 14, p 47.

22. "Labor Law and Practice in the Republic of China (Taiwan)," Washington, 1972, p 41; FCJ, Taipei, vol 1, No 15, 1984, pp 1, 3.

23. FEER, Hong Kong, 1982, vol 115, No 9, p 78.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1987

8850

**FRG Professionals' Role in Struggle for Peace, Progress**

18070061c Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I  
SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 87  
(signed to press 18 Nov 87) pp 178-181

[V.P. Iyerusalimskiy book review: "In the Field of Conflict Tension"]

[Text] Each new publication devoted to the professional classes in present-day bourgeois society invariably evokes the readers' particular interest—far from casual and by no means abstract-cognitive. Seen by the democratic and anti-imperialist forces and the communist parties as a strategic ally in the struggle for peace and social progress, the professional classes cannot fail to be an object of the closest, most concerned attention. The socio-class differentiation of the professional classes, their expanding and growing functions and social responsibility and the distinctiveness of their social assertiveness and democratic-anticapitalist potential requiring an adequate evaluation have for more than a decade been subjects of incessant debate among Marxist scholars. By virtue of the most essential characteristics of the professional activity of the intelligentsia and the diversity of the spheres of application of its particularly highly skilled labor—a diversity which has now become practically universal—the fate and problems of this social stratum are linked directly and with the utmost seriousness with all the tensest collisions of the modern



world. The sociopolitical assertiveness of the professional classes of the West, which has been growing markedly over the past two decades, is in this sense a characteristic and significant symptom of the intensification of the crisis of the capitalist system.

In the context of what has been said it would seem particularly important and valuable that the debates concerning the professional classes in modern capitalist society and the prospects of an "alliance of labor and culture" and "labor and science" and thoughts on a methodological and general theoretical plane at the end of the 20th century are coming to rely increasingly often on specific Marxist studies (pertaining either to the professional classes of this individual country or the other or to this vocational detachment of the other thereof). The monograph in question by H. Haupt, fellow of the Berlin International Policy and Economics Institute, on the West German professional classes is new confirmation of this. The confirmation in this case is all the more substantial in that the FRG professional classes represent rewarding material for the disclosure of certain general trends in the development of this social stratum in the system of state-monopoly capitalism in the atmosphere of the "third industrial revolution" and neoconservative "social revanche". Owing to a number of particular features of the country's socioeconomic and political development, the changes in the structure, position, sociopolitical orientations and assertiveness of the professional classes have been expressed in considerable relief here.

First, however, let us touch on questions opinions on which perform, possibly, the more or less auxiliary role of reference base for the author, who has not set herself the task of special theoretical-methodological definition research, but which in view of the continuing debate are invariably pertinent: concerning the essence, role and place of the professional classes under the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism and the new stage of the S&T revolution and the determining trends of their social development. Taking as a basis criteria which have become firmly established among Soviet specialists also, H. Haupt encompasses her opinions on these questions in highly capacious, precise and dialectically flexible wording.

The professionals, we read in the book, are a social stratum "distinguished by internal differentiation, maneuverability and high mobility between the working class and the bourgeoisie, specifically connected with the development of the present-day productive forces and occupying an intermediate position between the two main classes" of society under the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism. "...Thanks to their place in the social division of labor, they are employed mainly in brain work and... within the framework of the social division of labor perform organizing, planning and control functions, as, equally, the functions of the cultivation and dissemination of learning and ideologies and artistic creativity" (p 28). "As far as their place in the

system of social production under the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism is concerned, the professionals—in terms of their socioeconomic position and the functions which they perform—are identical neither to the working class nor the bourgeoisie...they occupy in relation to the two main classes a contradictory and extraordinarily dynamic intermediate position" (p 35). Inasmuch as "the socioeconomic position of the professionals is determined in principle by the interests of capital, they, in accordance with their functions in the social division of labor, are increasingly opposed to the working class. But at the same time, on the other hand, their labor is subordinated increasingly strongly to the power of capital.... The social development of the professionals under the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism represents the unity of their gradual rapprochement with the working class and the simultaneous reproduction of social remoteness therefrom" (p 36).

The logic of the author's thoughts concerning the pivotal process—the rapprochement of growing numbers of the professionals with the working class—leads to an important, although not directly formulated conclusion: "proletarianization" as a complex and uneven trend is proceeding more quickly and obviously on a macrosocial scale (deterioration in the conditions of the sale of highly skilled manpower on the labor market, increasing social uncertainty assuming serious dimensions of unemployment among persons with higher school degrees, intensifying collisions with the state-monopoly "aggregate capitalist") and in the sphere of reproduction of the work force (in which, in addition, significant numbers of professionals are concentrated). In the production sphere, on the other hand, "proletarianization" is being held back to a certain extent by differences in the content of labor, hierarchical structures and the particular role of specialists in the planning, organization and control of the production process. This dialectically contradictory unevenness and vari-paced nature of two levels of a single process could in the plane of the strategy of alliances, it would seem, be the basis for material conclusions in the sense of the specificity of the search for a community of interests and also forms and methods employed by organizations of the working class.

Altogether the subject of the rapprochement of a preponderance of the present-day professionals with the working class is given a thoughtful interpretation in the book accompanied by the ascertainment also of the objective and subjective factors and trends counteracting this rapprochement (pp 40-44). All the more strongly perplexing by its rectilinearity and particular disagreement with the entire course of the author's thought is the conclusion concerning the conflict between the professionals (all) and monopoly capital as an antagonistic contradiction (pp 37, 78). The antagonism, in the precise meaning of the word, grows, as known, from the contradiction between the main classes and represents an irreconcilable contradiction which may be resolved only through the elimination of one side of the contradiction

by its other side. But, we would emphasize, in the overall fabric of the study the said statement appears more as a publicistic exaggeration.

H. Haupt's monograph is logically broken down into two major thematic parts: 1) the socio-structural evolution of the professionals; changes in the objective conditions of their existence; the mainsprings of the growing involvement of the FRG's professionals in social and political conflicts; and 2) an analysis of the democratic, antiwar protest of the professionals proper and their general democratic, professional, ecological and other demands.

A strong aspect of the study are the well researched, highly diverse and precisely interpreted statistics and the presence of numerous tables with chronologically easily comparable data brought for the most part up to the mid-1980's. This quantitative and structural description of the subject of the research is so substantial that it is essential to reproduce if only some of its most important points. The dynamics of the development of the FRG professional classes reflecting the dynamics of the need of capital, the state and society for highly skilled manpower are illustrated by the following indicators. From 1961 through 1982 the proportion of specialists with specialized and scientific higher education in the gainfully employed population of the FRG tripled, amounting to 8.6 percent (2.3 million persons). Teachers, constituting a little less than one-third of the professional classes (approximately 700,000 persons), engineers (340,000) and physicians and pharmacists (220,000) are at the present time the most populous professional groups of the intelligentsia. Together these professional detachments encompass over one-half of higher school graduates. The highest rate of numerical growth in the 1970's was recorded among chemists, physicists and mathematicians (the numbers of specialists in these fields more than tripled between 1970 and 1982). The researcher records an important process: there has been a marked democratization in the past decade (thanks to a considerable extent to the policy of the SPD, which was in office) in the composition of higher school students, and the channels for advancement from the "small people" into the professional classes have been straightened out somewhat. Thus the proportion of persons registering in higher educational institutions from the worker environment grew between 1970 and 1983 from 9.7 to 19.7 percent, and from the families of office workers, from 34 to 39 percent, although, for all that, the proportion of persons delegated by government officials and "independents" to the academic sphere is today also 1.5-2 times higher than their relative significance in the gainfully employed population.

Profound changes in the character of the FRG professional classes are being ascertained in respect of such a determining criterion for social status as the attitude toward wage labor. Whereas in 1957 one out of every four higher school graduates began his career as an "independent," only one out of every seven did so in

1980. The constantly growing enlistment of the professionals in wage labor relations (in other words, the acquisition by their specifically highly skilled manpower of an increasingly mature commodity form) has entailed, albeit far from adequate and lagging, their nonetheless relatively assuredly ascending syndicalization, and, what is particularly important, furthermore, increasingly thanks to unification with workers in the ranks of the sectoral unions of the DGB. Whereas in 1970 they had 150,000 "academicians," in 1983 they had 500,000! According to data for 1980, the trade union organization encompassed 17 percent of specialists with higher education (compared with 9 percent in 1957). The most active in this respect was the group of teachers (25 percent), less active were medical personnel (6 percent) and lawyers (5 percent).

The convergence of significant numbers of the professional classes working for wages in terms of their position with the working class is attentively traced by H. Haupt per the criterion of the growth of instability and an unsupported existence. Having emerged as a mass phenomenon following the 1974-1975 crisis, unemployment among persons with higher education has grown rapidly and has by now become a permanent phenomenon not susceptible to the impact of economic recovery. The number of registered unemployed persons with degrees (and at times with doctorates) grew from 30,400 (1.5 percent) in 1975 to 114,600 (5.4 percent) in 1984. And, furthermore, the Teachers Union and the Democratic Science Union estimate, in reality the army of unemployed specialists with higher education is, at a minimum, twice as high. According to the data of a poll conducted at the end of the 1970's (see p 104), representatives of all intellectual occupations (with the exception of lawyers, medical practitioners and licensed engineers) placed job guarantees second out of the 16 sociopolitical problems put to them.

The scientific work of the scholar from the GDR thus adds many new substantial features to the characterization of the economic and social position of the FRG professional classes, in no way straightening out and oversimplifying the process of their "proletarianization" and emphasizing both the preservation by the professionals working for wages of certain privileges and their considerably higher remuneration (p 64). But the main idea of the book in question and its conceptual center of gravity nonetheless lie elsewhere—in the disclosure of the roots and nature of the growing opposition of the professional classes and the analysis and collation of the experience of the FRG professionals in the struggle for social and democratic rights, against the deployment of American first-strike missiles, in defense of the environment and for their professional interests.

H. Haupt justifiably links the growth of the professionals' opposition with the intensification of the contradictions and crisis phenomena in state-monopoly capitalism and shows convincingly how the FRG's monopoly elite has as of the mid-1970's approximately been

encountering additional difficulties in the use of the professionals as a most important support of its domination and in the regulation of its social relations with this stratum as a whole in general. The turn to the right marked by the establishment in office of a conservative cabinet, the new stage of the FRG's involvement in Washington's global strategy, the deployment on West German territory of American first-strike missiles, the dismantling of social gains and the infringement of the democratic achievements of preceding generations—all this together has struck palpably at the genuinely social interests whose spokesman and agent the professional classes are to a particular extent. The interests of individual categories thereof (teachers, for example) have suffered most here. Under these conditions the ruling class is endeavoring to broaden the range of methods of ideological attachment to itself of the professionals—the introduction of elitist, technocratic concepts and practice and a gamble on the social decomposition of the stratum and also direct administrative regulation and disciplinary pressure. As a result, the author concludes, the contradiction of the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie and the professional classes is objectively intensifying.

And, conversely, common points in the social position of the working intelligentsia and the working class are being manifested increasingly tellingly in the atmosphere of intensifying long-term crisis upheavals and the general political development of the 1980's, and their interests are to some extent coinciding directly increasingly often. However, the expert perceptively observes (warning against possible illusions), serious differences, including the economic, social and political relations with which the professionals and the working class link satisfaction of their requirements, are also brought about by differences in interests and in the focus of the assertiveness in the name of securing them. In any event, as of the present the social and political requirements of the preponderance of specialist professionals are reproduced at far higher levels of occupational skills and living and work conditions than among the working masses (p 99). Even the need for social protection, universal, seemingly, in the face of abrupt upheavals, and ideas concerning guarantees and ways of securing the material level that has been achieved themselves, stable employment and the conditions of the reproduction of manpower differ very considerably. On the scale of value orientations related to this set of problems a higher place among the professionals is occupied by the possibilities and prospects of the development of the personality secured by an improvement in the system of education, a wide-ranging information context, real rights of participation in determination of the conditions of labor activity, the establishment of new relations with the natural environment and so forth.

Taking as her basis the minutes, statements, appeals and proclamations of the most diverse unions and associations of persons of intellectual labor (from such influential ones with clear-cut positions as the Teachers Union,

the Democratic Science Union or the Democratic Lawyers Association through obscure small organizations, clubs and individuals), the author creates from kaleidoscopic quotidian information an impressive panorama of the heightening political assertiveness and antiwar and democratic protest of the FRG's professional classes. This protest was a most dynamic component of the general unprecedented upsurge of the peace movement of the first half of the 1980's and played a part of considerable importance in the regrouping of sociopolitical forces, which led to a rupture of the consensus of all leading parties which had existed on security problems, to the drift of the SPD in the direction of distinctly alternative positions in foreign and, to a certain extent, domestic policy and to the appearance in the form of the Green Party of a radical-democratic opposition in the parliamentary sphere.

The politicization of the professionals and their active involvement in the democratic and antimilitarist struggle could not if only owing to the distinctiveness of this stratum have failed to have been accompanied and mediated by tense ideological processes and ideological differentiation and delineation, which the monograph traces with great thoroughness. The author expresses highly cogent observations, specifically, concerning the inception of the new social movements, the specific psychological and political "alternative" culture which they are shaping and the projects of the future ("base democracy," the "unofficial economy," "self-governing models" and such) which they are developing.

The final chapter is devoted to the participation and role of the professional classes in the movement against the deployment of the American medium-range missiles and against the country's involvement in the American "star wars" plans. H. Haupt subscribes to the summary evaluation formulated by scientists from the Frankfurt Marxist Research Institute: "Representatives of the professional classes and broad middle strata constitute currently (at the start of the 1980's—V.I.) a large part of the active nucleus of the movement and its backbone, and the youth of this social stratum is particularly active, what is more" (p 154). The most diverse individual streams of intellectual protest have to a large extent merged in this struggle, and its former social and political experience has been synthesized and has risen to a new level. As of 1981 the peace movement has been exercising increasingly fully the function of center of attraction of all schools and forms of resistance and struggle against the conservative policy and the military-industrial complex. H. Haupt reveals the individual directions of this struggle and the specific motivations of the inclusion therein of various professional detachments of the intelligentsia, dwells on the most significant episodes, actions and initiatives and emphasizes that even following the start of the deployment of the American missiles the assertiveness of significant numbers of the professionals did not diminish, on the contrary, in a certain sense it grew and became enriched qualitatively even.

Impressions concerning the set of problems of H. Haupt's monograph have necessarily been expounded briefly here. Those interested will find in this serious, professionally written study many pages inducing further reflection on the prosp 1986, 189pp.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1987

8850

**Book on Trade Union Involvement in Peace Movement Reviewed**

18070061d Moscow *RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR* in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 87 (signed to press 18 Nov 87) pp 188-189

[A.Ye. Yefremov book review]

[Text] The democratic press of countries of all continents annually publishes numerous articles attesting the growth of the role of the mass organizations of the working people on the peace movement of our day. A merit of the author of the book in question\* is the thorough examination of this material and its systematization and collation and the recreation on this basis of the broad panorama of the antiwar activity of the unions in the 1980's against the general background of the acute confrontation between the forces of peace and war, primarily between the socialist policy of peace and detente and the imperialist policy of military preparations and the adding of new, most dangerous twists to the arms race spiral.

18070061d Moscow *RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR* in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 87 (signed to press 18 Nov 87) pp 188-189

[A.Ye. Yefremov book review]

[Text] The democratic press of countries of all continents annually publishes numerous articles attesting the growth of the role of the mass organizations of the working people on the peace movement of our day. A merit of the author of the book in question\* is the thorough examination of this material and its systematization and collation and the recreation on this basis of the broad panorama of the antiwar activity of the unions in the 1980's against the general background of the acute confrontation between the forces of peace and war, primarily between the socialist policy of peace and detente and the imperialist policy of military preparations and the adding of new, most dangerous twists to the arms race spiral.

The steady enlistment of the working masses in the struggle against the military threat presupposes recognition of the inseparable connection between the arms race and the deterioration in their economic position. The book emphasizes that in familiarizing themselves with peace actions the unions are endeavoring to find the optimum forms of the linkage of the struggle for peace and the struggle for socioeconomic progress—a trait naturally inherent in the unions' approach to the problem of war and peace. Participating increasingly actively in the general democratic peace movement, the unions are capable of perceiving with the greatest acuity the socioeconomic aspects of the arms race, and exposure of the danger of the military-industrial complexes' leading role in militarization is particularly important and necessary for them. Emphasizing the significance of this

problem, the author adduces in this connection indicative material showing how the policy of the military-industrial complexes of the imperialist states is leading to a colossal squandering of material and human place in the book is occupied also by illustration of the problems of the peoples' struggle against dictatorial regimes which have usurped power with the aid of military force and which are holding on to it given reliance not only on a huge machinery of repression but also on active support on the part of imperialism: reactionaries and executioners are being supplied with weapons and being trained in the most refined methods of dealing with patriots. For an intensification of the rebuff of dictatorial regimes tremendous significance is attached to the solidarity of working people of the whole world with the peoples suffering from the oppression of dictatorships or the attempts of imperialism and reaction to restore the power of the latter where the people have succeeded in ousting them. Thus, as the book emphasizes, many unions in Western countries, differing in their ideological persuasion, what is more, are condemning the United States' interventionist rebuff of dictatorial regimes tremendous significance is attached to the solidarity of working people of the whole world with the peoples suffering from the oppression of dictatorships or the attempts of imperialism and reaction to restore the power of the latter where the people have succeeded in ousting them. Thus, as the book emphasizes, many unions in Western countries, differing in their ideological persuasion, what is more, are condemning the United States' interventionist plans in Central America and demanding an end to the policy of repression being pursued by the cliques of Pinochet and other dictators. There is growing angry protest in the ranks of the international trade union movement against the apartheid regime, which is not only brutally suppressing the 25 million-strong nonwhite population of South Africa but also perpetrating aggressive actions against neighboring states which entail a threat to international peace and endeavoring to destabilize the situation in them and compel them to renounce the path of development chosen by the peoples. The unions are calling for the imposition of sanctions against South Africa in full and emphatically condemning imperialist attempts to perpetuate the illegal occupation of Namibia by forces of the racist regime.

The unions are encountering on the path of the essential further stimulation of their antiwar struggle obstacles and difficulties of an objective and subjective nature, to which the book pays close attention. Thus it exposes the myth of the Soviet "military threat," with which militarist circles to disorient world public opinion and ideologically indoctrinate the population for the purpose of winning its support for the aggressive preparations. A negative, disorienting role is being performed by the spread of the fraudulent idea of the "equal responsibility" of the USSR and the United States for the exacerbation of international tension. At the same time, it needs to be observed, positive, healthy trends are strengthening

in the Western peace movement as a whole currently under the influence of the peace offensive of the USSR and the socialist community countries, and the departure, in particular, of a number of representatives of reformist trade union centers from the proposition concerning the "equal responsibility of the superpowers" for the arms race is being observed; increasingly more people even in the leadership of these trade union centers, forswearing the fact-juggling and clichés of bourgeois propaganda, are coming to recognize that the increase in the military power of the USSR since the war has occurred merely in response to the practical attempts by the United States to achieve absolute military superiority.

Attempting to prevent the broad working masses' participation in the antiwar movement, the forces of imperialist reaction and militarism are subjecting fighters for peace to repression, which is bringing about the growing rebuff of the masses, which are resorting to various forms of expression of protest. Having joined the movement of fighters for peace, the organized working people have joined ranks with the participants in such mass democratic movements as the ecology, women's and youth movements. The participation of the unions is imparting a general and militant nature to the antiwar struggle, at the same time broadening their own experience of struggle and their political imagination.

In the front ranks of the army of organized working people of the world struggling for disarmament and peace, for the freedom of the peoples and social progress are the unions of the socialist countries. Their numerous peace actions are described in detail in the book.

For the successful struggle of the most populous organizations of the working people, V.M. Chigarev writes in conclusion, decisive significance is attached to a strengthening of the unions' unity of action on a national, regional and world scale. The book shows the tremendous contribution being made to the strengthening and development of such unity by the WFTU and international sectoral union associations.

#### Footnote

\* V.M. Chigarev, "Profsoyuzy i antivoyennoye dvizheniye" [The Unions and the Peace Movement], Moscow, Profizdat, 1986, 208pp.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1987

8850

#### Book on Relationship of Common Market, European Workers

18070061e Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I  
SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 87  
(signed to press 18 Nov 87) pp 189-190

[A.A. Iglitskiy book review]

[Text] Two planes are combined, as it were, in the content of R.Kh. Vildanov's monograph\*. The first is historical: it interprets the evolution of the very phenomenon of European capitalist integration, the place of the working class in this process and the significance of this process in the change in the conditions and the development of the content, forms and goals of the struggle of the working class. The second plane is historiographical: it represents the development of Marxist thought, primarily the ideological-theoretical and political views and positions of West European communist and workers parties, in respect of integration and the problems which it is putting on the agenda of the workers movement.

A direct effect of the organic combination of the said two planes has been theoretical and methodological precision in comprehension of the subject. The work reveals in theoretically consolidated fashion the objective nature of capitalist integration as a product of the development of society's productive forces. It represents a creation of the unity of the struggling opposites of labor and capital within the framework of the internationalization of the productive forces and production relations in which the leading role as a whole (and, consequently, the leading role specifically in determination of the goals, forms and methods of integration) belongs to monopoly capital. The working class, however, is here not only an object of exploitation and the particular policy of capital but also an active participant in the entire process struggling against the antipopular aspects and consequences of integration and taking advantage of the conditions it creates to enhance the level of its struggle and extend the list of demands, under whose influence, in turn, there is an expansion of the social activity of the "Common Market". Economic integration processes interweave with it very closely, and it itself is aimed primarily at lowering the level of social tension in capitalist Europe, specifically given the assistance of national-state and supranational regulation for the purpose of equalizing the conditions of work and its remuneration and other social and labor costs of production. This social "harmonization," R.Kh. Vildanov emphasizes, has expressed the aspirations of the captains of imperialist integration, first, to level the life and labor of the people's masses per the lowest indicators and, second, to create equal opportunities for competition for the monopoly groups of the Community countries. The book shows that neither the social policy of the EEC as a whole, the formation of a single manpower and capital market nor the expansion of the scale of industrial production and reciprocal trade have produced the promised socioeconomic benefits for the working people or removed the unevenness in the

levels of economic development and productivity. The class struggle of the working people has inevitably foiled "social harmonization" per the lowest level also.

As a whole, the development of capitalist integration within the EEC framework has led to the emergence of an additional knot in the system of interimperialist contradictions. The EEC, like any international state-monopoly association, is under demagogic slogans of "social and political partnership" realizing a new form of the division of the world capitalist market between the biggest alliances of capitalists.

The book examines with close attention the political aspects of "Common Market" activity. "The ultimate goal of imperialist integration," the author writes, "are by no means customs and economic agreements but, precisely, political union" (p 94). The book analyzes the corresponding trends of the 1970's, when the practice of the EEC countries' obligatory consultations on most important international questions became firmly established, when meetings of their leaders were transformed into a permanent institution—the European Council—and when decisions on the transition to direct elections to the European Parliament and also plans for the creation within the EEC framework of a European Political Union, based on a strengthening of the EEC's supranational institutions, were adopted. The creation of a kind of "political superstructure" with a common foreign and defense policy would signify conversion of the "Common Market" into a military-political association.

In the time that has elapsed since the signing of the 1957 Treaty of Rome there has been an accelerated transfer of surplus manpower to the industrial centers; investment activity and the migration of capital have been stimulated. Not confined by national barriers, a large united market is contributing to the development of mass and large-series production. All this is so. But nothing protects against cyclical and structural crises, overproduction and unemployment, currency fever and inflation and other permanent fellow travelers of the capitalist economy. Nor has there been a painless adaptation of the national economies to the demands of the EEC and an improvement in trade relations with the United States and Japan. The EEC approached its 30th anniversary given a state of crisis in economic and sociopolitical relations, a sharp exacerbation of the contradictions among its participants and an intensification of separatist tendencies. The activity of the "Common Market" has illumined more distinctly the conflict of labor and capital within a national framework and at the international level, which is contributing to a growth of the class struggle and the development of the unity of action of the workers movement both in individual countries of the Community and in capitalist Europe as a whole. The author points to the growth of the internationalization of the struggle of the working class under the conditions of capitalist integration and describes the positions of the communist and social democratic parties and unions of various persuasions.

The monograph is not without shortcomings. The section "In Place of a Conclusion," in which the author has attempted to answer "key questions" of the correlation of capitalist integration and the revolutionary process, falls away somewhat from its logical structure. These questions undoubtedly merit thorough and in-depth analysis, which, however, it is difficult to perceive "near the end of the act," divorced from the illustration of the book's main topics. Material characterizing the positions and policy of different communist parties and unions of the "Common Market" countries is distributed in the monograph unevenly, and the activity of the communists in the European Parliament is revealed insufficiently fully.

#### Footnote

\* R.Kh. Vildanov, "Rabochiy klass i 'Obshchiy rynek'" [The Working Class and the 'Common Market'], Moscow, "Nauka", 1985, 236pp.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1987

8850

#### Ecological Problems of 'Capitalist' Cities

18070061f Moscow *RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNYI MIR* in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 87 (signed to press 18 Nov 87) pp 192-193

[V.N. Baryakin book review]

[Text] While continuing the series of publications of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD on socio-ecological problems the book in question\* (the result of the fruitful collaboration of philosophers, sociologists, economists and historians) is simultaneously the summary work of the research group within the framework of the UNESCO international study program "Man and the Biosphere".\*\* Taking as the basis the assimilation of a vast amount of natural science and sociological information (mainly for the period from the mid-1970's through the start of the 1980's), the monograph has been written as an interdisciplinary, comprehensive and systemic study—in the nature of the subject itself.

The authors of the group work have made of paramount importance the task of an in-depth theoretical interpretation of the subject, taking into consideration the "certain discrepancy" which has taken shape "between the appreciable volume of works devoted to various aspects of study of socio-ecological problems of the city (economic, political, historical and cultural) and their theoretical interpretation" (p 7). The capitalist city with its ecological problems, the book emphasizes, is studied as a vital environment in which socio-reproductive processes are realized and which is a dialectical unity of external, environmental proper, and internal, organismic, properties of a city. The Marxist procedural principle of deducing the specifics of the ecological problem from the

antagonistic, spontaneous nature of the reproduction process under the conditions of capitalism makes it possible to understand its essence as a contradictory unity of ecological dangers and ecological requirements.

The semantic axis of the group study runs along ecological requirements—ecological demands lines. The historical and social determination of both, on the basis of specific area material included, is shown. In the most diverse historical-political context, the authors emphasize, an important regularity—the impact on ecological demands and civic initiatives on the part of psychological tendencies and political views which the working class cultivates in respect of the values of bourgeois society and the problems of social life—is invariably manifested in one way or another. The working people with their struggle against exploitation have always been an appreciable “city-shaping factor,” although the capitalist city has ultimately developed primarily as the “being of capital” (K. Marx). Under the conditions of the S&T revolution, however, the objective impossibility of the further development of the urban environment and its socio-reproduction mechanism merely as a secondary result of the development of material production is being expressed in the ecological demands of the working people and the broad democratic forces sweeping away the subterfuges in which the egotism of capital is combined with the hypocrisy of rightwing-conservative politicians (“clean air or jobs”).

Within the framework of the historical understanding of the process of urbanization as a form of general social progress the book reveals the connection of the present decline in which the capitalist city finds itself and the exacerbation of the general crisis of capitalism. It is with a particular reason that the current state of the urbanized industrially highly developed capitalist society is characterized by a sharp deterioration in the entire ecological situation of urban territories and simultaneously the sharply expressed “polarized” nature of class contradictions. The city is not only laying bare the antagonistic essence of the socio-ecological problems of capitalism—it has also become an arena of struggle of the most diverse social strata for a viable biosphere and the humanitarian solution of present-day local, regional and global problems.

Taking as the basis the collation of a vast amount of material, the authors study the dynamics of the working people's demands on the urban environment and ascertain the correlation in them of the class and the national, local and general and subjective (the “perceived environment” phenomenon) and objective. The chapters of the book examine the interconnections between the ecological requirements and demands and the mass movements of various social strata of the city. The character and essence of the most populous and characteristic ecological and general democratic movements in the West are examined. Highlighting the place and role of the nature-conservation demands in their social and

political programs, the authors trace also the close connection of the content of these demands and other burning problems of the present-day—peace and disarmament, satisfaction of raw material and energy requirements and the surmounting of the lagging by a number of countries and regions behind the developed states.

The book attempts to “classify” according to content the basic directions of the development of ecological demands. It moves along the lines of expansion of the problem-solving sphere, expansion of the strata of the population introduced to the movement, comprehension of the social essence of the problems and transition from psychological-emotional reactions to the advancement of scientifically substantiated projects and, finally, along politicization lines. Ultimately the unifying feature in the picture of demands, differentiated more or less by country, presented by the authors is the simultaneous interest in both local and general, global problems, and the treatment of problems of war and peace, what is more, the book emphasizes, has marked a qualitatively new stage in the development of urban social movements.

The class aspect and that common to all mankind interact, the authors sum up their analysis, in the development of the “environmental” demands of the working people of the capitalist city. The course of history entirely confirms and is increasingly making an actuality the propositions of Marxist-Leninist theory concerning the unity and concurrence of interests of the whole human race and the class interests of the proletariat and concerning the fact that people's mutual relations and their interrelationship with nature are aspects of a single problem. The processes of integration of the sciences occurring in the sphere of socio-ecological studies also ultimately reflect the same deep-lying essence. The science of nature, the founders of Marxism wrote, incorporates the science of man to the same extent that the science of man incorporates the science of nature; this will be one science (see K. Marx and F. Engels, “Works,” vol 42, p 124).

#### Footnotes

\* “*Ekologicheskiye problemy kapitalisticheskogo goroda*” [Ecological Problems of the Capitalist City], Exec. eds. A.I. Belchuk, B.M. Maklyarskiy, O.N. Yanitskiy, Moscow, “Nauka”, 184pp.

\*\* For this program and the participation of the IMRD therein see, for example, Ye.S. Shomina, “The Ecology of the City as a Sphere of Social Activity” in RK i SM No 2, 1985, p 163 and subsequently.

COPYRIGHT: “*Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir*”, 1987



**Index of Articles Published in 1987**

18070061g Moscow *RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR* in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 87 (signed to press 18 Nov 87) pp 196-198

[Text] S.L. Agayev, "Perestroika in the Light of the Historical Experience of Social Revolutions" .....(No 5)

S.L. Agayev, "Political Realities of the Developing World and Social Dialectics".....(No 6) S.G. Ayvazova, "France's 'New Women': Who Are They?".....(No 4)

A. Akkornero, "'Tertiarization' of the Industrial Conflict" .....(No 3)

A.P. Andreyev, A.A. Ivanov, "Marxism in Africa and the Contemporary Ideological Struggle" .....(No 3)

E.A. Arsenyev, "Youth Protests in France" .....(No 3)

A.L. Arefyev, "African Youth: Labor Problems".....(No 6)

V.G. Afanasyev, "The New Political Thinking" ..(No 2)

V.D. Belkin, V.I. Perevedentsev, "The Food Problem and the Lessons of Akchi" .....(No 4)

V.B. Benevolenskiy, A.A. Kuteynikov, "Labor and Capital in the United States at the Current Stage of the S&T Revolution" .....(No 6)

Yu.I. Berezina, "Dynamics of the Social and Political Orientation of the Japanese Working People" .....(No 3)

Ye.P. Blinova, "Working Women of the Capitalist Countries in the 1980's" .....(No 5)

V.M. Bykov, "Specifics of the Social and Political Views of U.S. Youth in the 1980's" .....(No 1)

S.I. Vasil'tsov, "The Price of Political 'Equilibrium': the Marginals and Society in the South of Capitalist Europe" .....(No 2)

Yu.A. Vasilchuk, "Formation of the Competitive Mechanism of the Development of the S&T Revolution Under Capitalism".....(No 5)

A.B. Veber, "The Class Struggle and Capitalist Distribution" .....(No 4)

V.Ya. Vulf, "'Mass Culture'—the 1980's (New Trends and Features)" .....(No 3)

N.I. Vysotskaya, "Present-Day Social Democracy: the African Perspective".....(No 5)

A.A. Galkin, "Italian-Soviet Dialogue: Trends and Prospects" .....(No 4)

V.G. Gelbras, "Social Shifts in Chinese Society".....(No 3)

R. Gibson, "The Unions Must Uphold the Working People's Interests" .....(No 3)

L. Gileyko, "Role of the Working Class in Present-Day Poland" .....(No 2)

L.A. Gordon, G.A. Monusova, A.K. Nazimova, "New Forms of the Team Organization of Labor: Problems, Contradictions, Prospects".....(No 1)

Yevg. Daynov (Bulgaria): "The 'New' Conservatism and the British Unions" .....(No 6)

Ye.V. Demushkina, "Democratization Processes in Latin America and the Communists".....(No 5)

S.V. Deryugin, "Latin America: Development of the Dialogue of Marxists and Christians" .....(No 2)

G.G. Diligenskiy, "The Phenomenon of the Masses and Mass Movements: Socio-Psychological Aspects".....(No 3)

A.A. Dregalo, O.V. Ovchinnikov, "The Place of the Foreman on the Shop Floor" .....(No 4)

R.Ya. Yevzerov, "Pondering the Procedure of Study of Present-Day Capitalism" .....(No 5)

S.A. Yershov, "Capitalism Today: What Is Happening With the Unions?" .....(No 6)

Kh.T. Zagladina, "Racism, the Tories and the Workers Movement" .....(No 5)

A.S. Zaychenko, "The 'Nouveaux' Riches in the United States" .....(No 4)

A.G. Zdravomyslov, "The New Sociopolitical Thinking and the 'Technological Challenge' Problem" .....(No 6)

Yu.M. Ivanov, "Material on the Working Conditions of African Workers" .....(No 2)

A.I. Izyumov, "The United States: Worker Participation in Management (Economic and Social Aspects)".....(No 5)

A.P. Karavayev, "Brazil: Search for a Way Out of the Crisis" .....(No 3)

A.-V. Karlsen, "'Country of Reservations' (Certain Features of the Present-Day Antiwar Movement in Denmark)" .....(No 1)

I.M. Klyamkin, "For the Theoretical Assimilation of Current Realities (Notes from the All-Union Social Scientists Symposium)" .....(No 2)

V.K. Kolomiyets, "Gramsci's Legacy and the Present Day" .....(No 6)



- V.B. Kuvaldin, "United States: From Mid-Term to Presidential" .....(No 4)
- A.V. Kuzmishchev, "Formation of the Sandinista Front in Nicaragua" .....(No 1)
- V.V. Kulikov, "Structure and Forms of Realization of Socialist Ownership" .....(No 5)
- M.I. Lapitskiy, "In the Industrial Heartland of America" .....(No 2)
- V.V. Lyubimova, L.I. Solovyeva, "Poverty in 'Rich' Capitalist Countries" .....(No 1)
- V.V. Lyublinskiy, "Employers' Strategy and the Living Conditions of the French Working People" .....(No 3)
- V.K. Malov, "The S&T Revolution and the Working Class of Capitalist Countries" .....(No 1)
- L.Ya. Mashezerskaya, "Crisis of 'Social Shock Absorbers'" .....(No 3)
- B.I. Medvedev, "The CEMA Countries: Strategy of Acceleration" .....(No 3)
- A.P. Midler, "The 'Not Yet a Specialist' on the Shop Floor" .....(No 6)
- "Urgent Changes" .....(No 2)
- S.I. Nesterov, "Tory Offensive Against the 'Closed Shop'" .....(No 4)
- S&T Progress, Culture, the Working Class (Roundtable).....(Nos 5, 6)
- E.Ye. Obminskiy, B.I. Slavnyy, "Socioeconomic Shifts and the Working Class in the Asia-Pacific Region".(No 1)
- A.S. Oganova, V.I. Semenov, "Trade Union Seminar in Britain" .....(No 6)
- I.K. Pantin, "October and the Liberation Mission of the Working Class" .....(No 3)
- "May Day in Documents and the Testimony of Contemporaries" .....(No 2)
- V.I. Perevedentsev, "Changes in the Structure of Employment and Starting One's Career" .....(No 6)
- V.V. Potapov, "Important Direction of the Class Struggle (the West's Trade Unions in Support of Diversification and the Conversion of Military Production)".(No 1)
- A.M. Salmin, "Temporary and Part-Time Employment in France: Basic Development Trends".....(No 4)
- N.M. Stepanova, "Third Victory of Britain's Neoconservatives: Certain Socioeconomic Aspects".....(No 6)
- V.A. Sycheva, "Taiwan: Economic Development and the Working Class" .....(No 6)
- N.N. Tarasova, "Anti-Union Campaign in the United States" .....(No 5)
- Gr. (Tarpinyan), "The Working Class and the New Technology" .....(No 3)
- T.T. Timofeyev, "The Post-October Era and the Contradictions of Capitalism" .....(No 4)
- K. Turysov, "Along the Path of Perestroika" .....(No 4)
- T. Fuva, "Lenin and the Workers' Struggle for Their Demands" .....(No 2)
- A.D. Khlopin, "Change in the Capitalist Organization of Labor and the Workman's Personality" .....(No 6)
- R.I. Tsvylev, "On the Threshold of the 21st Century: the Capitalist Information Economy and the Working Class" .....(No 4)
- I.D. Chigrin, "The Proletariat of Weimar Germany in the Struggle for an 8-Hour Work Day (1918-1923)".(No 6)
- S.A. Shalayev, "Pivotal Stage" .....(No 1)
- V.L. Sheynis, "The Developing Countries and the New Political Thinking" .....(No 4)
- A.S. Shin, "Revolutionary-Democratic Parties in Asian and African Countries" .....(No 6)
- V.A. Shinbin, "The Communists and Unions of Italy" .....(No 3)
- Yu.V. Shishkov, "Historical Fate of Commodity Production" .....(No 6)
- G.I. Yanayev, "The International Workers Movement: New Experience" .....(No 5)
- Z.P. Yakhimovich, "The Communist Parties' Elaboration of a Democratic Alternative" .....(No 4)
- Material of an International Science Conference A.B. Bardkhan (India), "The S&T Revolution, Industrial Development and the Working Class" .....(No 2)
- In Confrontation With the Forces of Reaction and War (Survey).....(No 1)
- S. Gaspar (WFTU), "The Working Class in a Changing World" .....(No 1)

W. Gerns (FRG), "Structural Changes in the Working Class and Communists' Policy".....(No 1)

C. Jagan (Guyana), "The Working Class and Current Problems".....(No 1)

W. Kashtan (Canada), "Certain New Problems Confronting the Working Class".....(No 1)

Yu.A. Krasin (USSR), "That Which Is Common to All Mankind and the Class Factor in the Struggle for Peace".....(No 2)

Y. Lindemans, (Belgium), "Pre-Election Economics of Prosperity: Arms Economy or Peace Economy".....(No 1)

E. del Liano, Rosario A. Canal (Cuba), "The Workers Movement and the Present Day".....(No 2)

The S&T Revolution: Strategy of Capital—Challenge to the Working Class (Survey).....(Nos 1, 2)

J. Norlund (Denmark), "The Working Class in the Modern World".....(No 1)

B.N. Ponomarev (USSR), "Militarism and the Working Class".....(No 2)

The Working Class of the Developing Countries: Reality and Prospects of Struggle (Survey).....(No 2)

I. Stoyanovic (Yugoslavia), "The Working Class and Problems of the Market Under Socialism".....(No 2)

J. Stewart (Ireland), "Present-Day Imperialism and the Working Class".....(No 1)

Technical Progress, the Working Class and Socialism (Survey).....(No 2)

E. Froeschl (Austria), "Decisive Reference Point".....(No 2)

G. Hall (United States), "The Present Day and the Class Struggle".....(No 1)

International Scientific-Practical Conference

The 70th Anniversary of the Great October and the Present-Day Trade Union Movement; October and Present-Day Unions; Peace, Labor, Development; "Unions on the Threshold of the 21st Century" (Roundtable Conference).....(No 5)

Perestroika and the Working Class (Scholars of the Socialist Countries Exchange Opinions).....(No 5)

Our Publications

PRC Law on Enterprise Bankruptcies.....(No 4)

PRC State Council Regulation on the Work of CCP Local Organizations at Publicly Owned Enterprises.....(No 6)

PRC State Council Regulation on Worker and Employee Representative Meetings at Publicly Owned Enterprises.....(No 6)

Regulation on the Work of the Director of a Publicly Owned Industrial Enterprise.....(No 4)

Program of Polish Trade Unions.....(No 5)

Criticism and Bibliography

A.B. Belenskiy, "The Revolutionary Process in the East in the Post-October Period".....(No 5)

A.A. Galkin, "The Workers Movement as an Economic Force".....(No 6)

I.Ye. Gorodetskaya, "Women Against Pit Closures (Details in the Portrait of the British Miners' Strike)".....(No 1)

K.G. Gorokhova, "The Economic Platform of Swedish Social Democracy in the 1980's (From the Journal TYDEN)".....(No 3)

A.V. Vetrov, "France: Sources of Exacerbation of the Class Antagonism".....(No 5)

N.S. Vetrova, "Focus of the Ailments of Capitalist Society".....(No 4)

Ye.D. Voznesenskaya, "Youth Shift of the Working Class: Today and Tomorrow (Group Work of Scholars of the Socialist Countries)".....(No 3)

V.V. Damy, "The 'Green' Movement: Potential, Trends, Prospects".....(No 5)

V.Z. Drobizhev, S.A. Pogodin, "The Working Class Past and Present".....(No 2)

B.I. Dubson, "Present-Day Capitalism and Work Time".....(No 4)

Yu.V. Yegorov, "Sons of Working France".....(No 3)

M.A. Zaborov (deceased), "Studies and Publications on Problems of the Workers Movement (Bibliographical Survey of the Works of Scholars of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD in the 1980's)".....(No 5)

V.P. Iyerusalimskiy, "In the Field of Conflict Tension".....(No 6)

L.G. Istyagin, "Austria: Evolution of Social Clericalism".....(No 4)

B.G. Kapustin, "Britain: the S&T Revolution and the Structure of the Working Class (from Discussion in the Press)".....(No 4)

G.V. Katsman, "Born of the October Era".....(No 5)

I.Ya. Kiselev, "Position and Struggle of the FRG Working Class Under the Conditions of the 'Neoconservative Shift'".....(No 3)

Ye.M. Kozhokin, "Radical-Left Utopia: Comprehension of the Phenomenon (Images and Essence of Left Radicalism)".....(No 4)

V.I. Maslov, "Capitalism and 'Participation'".....(No 6)

K. Petrov, "Consciousness of a Class".....(No 5)

B.V. Pospelov, "Japan Shorn of Exotica (Capitalism and the Family)".....(No 6)

Ya.G. Rokityanskiy, "Pre-Marxist Socialism and the Development of the Proletariat".....(No 1)

O.K. Timashkova, "Burden of Contradictions (the 'Popular Socialists' of Denmark and Norway)".....(No 6)

M.I. Fedorov, "Ideological-Political Character of Present-Day Social Democracy".....(No 4)

G.N. Cherkasov, G.A. Silantyeva, "Development of the USSR Working Class: Problems and Prospects".....(No 1)

V.Ya. Shveytser, "Social Democrats and the African South".....(No 3)

K.K. Shirinya, "The Workers Movement From its Sources Through Our Day".....(No 3)

Books in Brief.....(Nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 6)

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1987

8850

### Chinese Decrees on Public Enterprises Translated, Published

[Editorial report] Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 6 for November-December 1987 carries on pages 157-166 the text of two decrees from the PRC Council of Ministers on publicly-owned enterprises. They are "Decree of the PRC Council of Ministers on Meetings of Representatives of Workers and Employees at Enterprises of Public Ownership" enacted on 15 September 1986 and "Decree of the PRC Council of Ministers on the Work of Local Organizations of the CCP at Enterprises of Local Ownership," also enacted on 15 September 1986.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1987

### Articles in RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR Not Translated

18070061i Moscow RABOCHIY KLAS I  
SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 87  
(signed to press 18 Nov 87)

[Text] The New Sociopolitical Thinking and the 'Technological Challenge' Problem (A.G. Zdravomyslov) . pp 3-15

The Historical Fate of Commodity Production (Yu.V. Shishkov) ..... pp16-30

Change in the Capitalist Organization of Labor and the Workman's Personality (A.D. Khlopin) ..... pp 31-42

Labor and Capital in the United States at the Current Stage of the S&T Revolution (V.B. Benevolenskiy, A.A. Kuteynikov) ..... pp 43-53

Shifts on the Employment Structure and the Start on One's Career (V.I. Perevedentsev) ..... pp 54-65

The 'Not Yet a Specialist' on the Shop Floor (A.P. Midler) ..... pp 66-75

Capitalism Today: What Is Happening With the Trade Unions? (S.A. Yershov) ..... pp 76-85

S&T Progress, Culture and the Working Class (Roundtable, Conclusion) ..... pp 100-109

Third Victory of Britain's Neoconservatives: Certain Socioeconomic Aspects (N.M. Stepanova) . pp 110-119

The 'New' Conservatism and Britain's Trade Unions (Yevg. Daynov) ..... pp 120-132

African Youth: Labor Problems (A.L. Arefyev) ..... pp 133-139

Revolutionary-Democratic Parties in Asian and African Countries (A.S. Shin) ..... pp 145-151

The Proletariat of Weimar Germany in the Struggle for an 8-Hour Work Day (1918-1923) (I.D. Chigrin) .... pp 152-156

Trade Union Seminar in Britain (A.S. Oganova, V.I. Semenov) ..... pp 167-168

Gramsci's Legacy and the Present Day (V.K. Kolomi-yets) ..... pp 168-172

The Workers Movement as an Economic Force (A.A. Galkin) ..... pp 173-175

Capitalism and 'Participation' (V.I. Maslov) ... pp 175-178

Burden of Contradictions ('Popular Socialists' of Denmark and Norway) (O.K. Timashkova) ..... pp 181-183

Japan Shorn of Exotica (Capitalism and the Family) (B.V. Pospelov) ..... pp 183-186

Review of Ya.S. Drabkin's 'Four Steadfast People' (V.V. Chistyakov) ..... pp 186-188

Review of S.M. Khenkin's 'Petty Bourgeois Democracy in Brazil. 1920's-1930's' (T.Yu. Zabelina) ..... 190-191

Review of A.L. Semenov's 'United States: Search for New Forms of Exploitation of the Working People' (S.Ye.) ..... pp 191-192

Review of Ye.S. Shomina's 'Contrasts of the American City' (V.M. Kharitonov) ..... pp 194-195

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir",  
1987  
8850

**Publication Data**

18070061j Moscow *RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR* in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 87  
(signed to press 18 Nov 87)

[Text] English title: THE WORKING CLASS AND THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

Russian title: RABOCHIY KLAS I SOVREMENNY MIR

Editor: I.K. Pantin

Publishing house: Izdatelstvo "Progress"

Place of publication: Moscow

Date of publication: November-December 1987

Signed to press: 18 November 1987

Copies: 10,000

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir",  
1987